The Report Committee for Quinn David Sorenson
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:

The Centrality of Legitimacy and the Limitations of the Small Footprint Approach to Military Operations

APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:

Supervisor:

William Inboden

Paul Miller

The Centrality of Legitimacy and the Limitations of the Small Footprint Approach to Military Operations

by

Quinn David Sorenson, BA History

Professional Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of

The University of Texas at Austin

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements

for the Degree of

Master of Public Affairs

The University of Texas at Austin

May 2017

Dedication

I dedicate this project to those who have made my personal success possible and who have inspired me to think and care deeply about the way we fight our nation's wars. To Daniel Metcalfe, Andrew Sipple, Jason Togi, Edward Reynolds, Adam Ross, George Wood, James Justice and Mohammad Zaqir, my dear friends who gave their lives in faithful service to the United States, the memory of your service is an ever-present reminder of the human cost of war and the moral necessity of thinking deeply about the strategies we pursue. To my family, specifically my wife Archimedes, and our children, Evelyn, Abigail, Olivia, Zachariah, Maria, Peter, and Edith, your love and encouragement have sustained and inspired me throughout the years.

Acknowledgements

I am deeply indebted to the many leaders, mentors, and faculty members who have advised, mentored, inspired, and provided leadership for this project.

First, I am indebted to Brigadier General Robert Whittle Jr. for inspiring me to continue my education at the University of Texas and to pursue a teaching position at the United States Military Academy.

I am thankful to Professors William Inboden, Jeremi Suri, and Dr. Paul Miller for the generous donation of their time and thoughtful critique of my work. I relied heavily on their guidance and subject matter expertise to sharpen my argument and improve this project.

I also thank Jen Cooper for her tireless efforts to improve my writing and help me to communicate this subject matter more effectively.

Abstract

The Centrality of Legitimacy and the Limits of the Small Footprint Approach to Military Operations

Quinn David Sorenson, MPAff

The University of Texas at Austin, 2017

Supervisor: William Charles Inboden

War must be understood as it is, not as we wish it to be. This dictum of Carl von Clausewitz is as relevant today as it was in his time. Now, in the wake of 15 years of persistent low intensity conflict, policymakers argue over the application of military force in the contemporary threat environment. The Powell Doctrine advocates overwhelming force to ensure victory. Detractors, such as David Kilcullen, argue that overwhelming force in the current environment breeds host nation dependence and resentment among the people, and that a "small footprint" approach is more effective. I argue that neither an application of overwhelming force nor a commitment to a small footprint is appropriate under all circumstances. I argue for the centrality of legitimacy as the necessary objective, and that intervening forces, through a comprehensive strategy of regional engagement, can successfully legitimize an illegitimate regime using direct or indirect methods appropriately tailored to the context. I draw on two successful small footprint operations, the American engagement in the Philippines and the French Intervention in Mali, as case studies to define the characteristics of the regime, insurgency, and intervention that enable success.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1: Introduction

I arrived at the district center to meet with the district sub-governor. I removed my body armor, placed my rifle in the front seat of my truck, and instructed my driver to monitor the radio. My platoon sergeant coordinated the security posture, assigned sectors of fire and established a guard rotation as my interpreter and I discussed my talking points. I developed the habit of removing my armor during meetings as a gesture of respect for the Afghan leadership. There was a growing tension due to recent allegations that the sub governor had solicited bribes and was engaged in other corrupt activities, and I felt it was important to communicate that I felt safe inside the district center where the Afghan National Police provided security. I feared the worsening of the relationship and the consequences it would have on security for the district, and I was convinced that I could still salvage it through personal diplomacy. After all, a week prior the sub-governor offered me a gift (a Russian made shotgun that I refused due to ethical considerations) and invited me to the wedding of one of his relations. Our friendship had cooled since then.

I grabbed my hand-held radio, holstered my pistol, and my interpreter and I made our way toward the sub-governor's office for our scheduled meeting. A young Afghan police officer assigned as a sort of domestic servant to the sub-governor invited me into the office and informed me that the sub-governor would be with me shortly. Under normal circumstances, the sub-governor would have greeted me personally. During our many prior meetings, his servant would provide chai tea and an assortment of dried chick peas, raisins, and candied almonds. On that day, traditional Afghan hospitality was conspicuously missing.

Several minutes later, the sub-governor entered the room with four armed guards. He sat at his desk while guards flanked him at either side, and the remaining two stood

beside the door to effectively block my exit. It was clear that he intended to make me uncomfortable. My interpreter was visibly nervous. I greeted the sub-governor with the traditional Afghan greeting, placing my hand over my heart to demonstrate sincerity. He coldly reciprocated the gesture, and our meeting began.

I informed him that I was suspending all funding for development projects due to allegations of corruption. The district was authorized a budget of $250,000 per quarter under the Commander's Emergency Response Program, the primary program that US forces employed to fund reconstruction and development projects at the district level. The conversation became heated, and he demanded to know what information I was basing my decision on. I feared for the safety of my sources, and I told him what I knew, careful not to reveal the origin of the information. Unbeknownst to him, I'd been collecting information on his various corrupt activities for weeks.

My higher headquarters implemented a concept known as preferential bidding. The purpose of the program was to give the local government authorities greater control over the companies contracted to work inside their district boundaries. The central concept was that when a project was approved through the District Development Assembly (DDA), a democratically elected council to prioritize reconstruction efforts at the local level, companies that originated within the district would have an open bid while companies from outside of the district would participate in a closed bidding process. The idea was to maximize the benefit to the local community by hiring local companies instead of outside firms. In theory, it would significantly improve the economic conditions in the district.

The sub-governor had unlawfully injected himself into the bidding process. Because of the competitive advantage afforded to local companies, several members of the DDA, and relatives of the sub-governor, quickly founded construction companies and attempted to participate in the bidding directly. The sub-governor, feeling that he was

positioned to determine winners and losers, began accepting bribes of $5,000 from contractors who wished to bid on contracts. These companies, hastily established to secure contracts believed to be guaranteed, lacked the expertise to fulfill the contracts they wished to compete for. The result of granting contracts to these companies would have amounted to a significant waste, would not have improved the lives of the local people, and would undermine the legitimacy of the Afghan government by allowing government officials to exploit their positions of power for personal gain. It was antithetical to the idea behind the program. I now stood between him and his ability to make good on the promises that he made to these companies. The sub-governor promised contracts, and my refusal to enable his corruption undermined his position.

The sub-governor, through his corrupt actions, undermined the government's legitimacy. Legitimacy was widely recognized as the ultimate objective of the counterinsurgency strategy in Afghanistan. Field manual 3-24, the Army's counterinsurgency manual states, "Victory is achieved when the populace consents to the government's legitimacy and stops actively and passively supporting the insurgency."[1] The centrality of legitimacy as the overall purpose of the counterinsurgency campaign was also captured in mission statements at every echelon. According to our military doctrine, the central battle between the insurgency and the host nation is this struggle for legitimacy.[2] In the situation above, the Taliban espoused a narrative of an illegitimate puppet government acting as an American client. The sub-governor's actions confirmed the Taliban narrative.

[1] Field Manual, *Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies*, Washington DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, (2006), 1-3.
[2] Ibid, 1-8.

My predicament was certainly not a unique occurrence. To enhance the legitimacy of the government the U.S. Army focused on reconstruction projects, security, and economic development. These projects, as I alluded to earlier, flooded these districts with cash and brought extensive opportunities for corruption and challenges to establishing legitimacy. Through our efforts to legitimize the government, we opened the door for simultaneous de-legitimization. This unfortunate occurrence placed American military leaders in a precarious position where they had to choose between legitimizing the government's leadership and pursuing what is ultimately best for the Afghan people, subject to their own judgment. The challenge inherent in intervention is precisely this question of legitimacy. Can an intervening force enhance the legitimacy of a third party? I argue that the United States can in fact enhance the legitimacy of a foreign regime under the appropriate circumstances. The question of a direct or indirect approach is subordinate to the objective of legitimacy. Strategists, however, must not allow a preference for a given means to influence a distortion of the necessary ends, nor can they overlook the significance of context in defining the means required to achieve those ends.

The difficulty of legitimizing a host nation government through armed intervention has caused many in the defense establishment to advocate a more indirect approach. Colonel Gregory Wilson argues that a large military presence undermines the legitimacy of the intervention and prevents the nascent institutions from developing.[3] The inference is that smaller interventions, intentionally designed to minimize the presence of foreign

[3] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review*, November-December (2006), 3.

troops are a more effective method for counterinsurgency operations. David Kilcullen, a prominent counterinsurgency theorist espouses what he refers to as the anti-Powell doctrine:

> Planners should select the lightest, most indirect and least intrusive form of intervention that will achieve the necessary effect. Policymakers should work by, with, and through partnerships with local government administrators, civil society leaders, and local security forces wherever possible.[4]

The intellectual impetus of minimizing the footprint of counterinsurgency or stability operations is given further credence by a combination of technological and political factors. Large footprint operations are costly in terms of blood, treasure, and political will. However, our current National Security Advisor, H.R. McMaster, castigates this trend toward minimalist thinking as an outgrowth of capabilities based analysis that seeks to define the operational environment as contingent upon American military strength independent of an honest appraisal of the threat. This line of thinking emerged after the overwhelming victory in the first Gulf War.[5] On this point, Clausewitz is instructive saying,

> the first, the supreme, the most far reaching act of judgment that the statesman and commander have to make is to establish the kind of war on which they are embarking, neither mistaking it for, nor trying to turn it into something that is alien to its nature[6]

The importance of understanding the war as it is, and not as we wish it to be, should lead us to reject analysis that does not account for the unique context of the crisis under consideration. This trend towards minimalism fails to ascribe agency to our adversaries, inadequately accounts for the context in which our forces must operate, and presumes that

---

[4] Caroline Baxter et al, *The Uses and Limits of Small-Scale Military Interventions* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2012), 8.
[5] H.R. McMaster, "On War: Lessons to be Learned," *Survival*, 50 (2008): 19.
[6] Carl von Clausewitz, *On War*. (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976), 88.

through superior technology and training the United States military can dictate the form of the campaign.

Neither an application of overwhelming force nor a commitment to a small footprint approach is appropriate under all circumstances. We must understand the regime that we seek to legitimize, the insurgency that we seek to destroy or neutralize, and the regional context in which we seek to intervene. This borders on the obvious, but it must be understood that policymakers have failed to recognize the limits of American power in recent history. The initial commitment to the small footprint approach in Afghanistan is but one example of this. To this end, I argue that intervening forces, through armed intervention and regional engagement can legitimize a previously illegitimate regime using direct or indirect methods appropriately tailored to the context. I have conducted two case studies of successful small-footprint operations, French intervention in Mali in 2013 and the American intervention in the Philippines in 2002, to define the regime, insurgency, and intervention characteristics that enabled successful intervention. I do not imply that intervention is a panacea, in fact I intend to communicate the opposite. By illustrating the significance of contextual factors beyond the intervening power's control, I intend to demonstrate the significance of understanding the operational environment and tailoring expectations and objectives to the appropriate context rather than to military capabilities and political intentions.

My research finds that there is a relationship between government capacity and legitimacy. Both case studies confirm Stephen Watts findings in *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, that regime capacity determines the range of options available for prosecuting a

counterinsurgency strategy.[7] Legitimacy is difficult for a regime to achieve if the regime relies on methods of coercion that undermine public support for the regime's authority. In this respect, intervening forces can provide the additional capacity to ensure the regime has the tools and training necessary to pursue a counterinsurgency strategy that strengthens the regime's claim to legitimate authority.

In both Mali and the Phillipines, the host nation required the assistance of intervening powers to legitimize the government. This precedent of an external power enhancing the legitimacy of the host nation augurs well for American counterinsurgents. Here again, this depends on context and the specific role played by outside powers informs the limits of American intervention. In both cases, the interventions and the governments were made legitimate by the actions of regional power-brokers. In the case of the Philippines, both the insurgency and the government appealed to external powers to legitimize the peace process. In the case of Mali, the French leveraged Algerian diplomacy to legitimize the intervention and build regional support for the Malian government. In both cases, legitimizing the intervention and the regime required overtures by the regime and reconcilable elements of the insurgency and it must be understood that the interveners capitalized on these circumstances and did not manufacture them. Legitimacy was also a product of the ends to be achieved and should not be considered as an end in and of itself. Legitimacy must be inherent in the methods employed, accumulated throughout the intervention, and wisely stewarded if it is to be leveraged in favor of a peaceful resolution.

In addition to the characteristics of the regime, certain characteristics inherent in the insurgency enable us to assess the likelihood of a resolution to the crisis. For example, the insurgency's ideological orientation and ethnic identity significantly impact the

[7] Watts, Stephen. *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 28

likelihood of obtaining a negotiated settlement. In both case studies, multiple groups with varying aims competed for influence inside ungoverned spaces. Historic grievances of non-representation in the body politic, and active violence against ethnic minorities, were the at the origin of both conflicts. In both cases, these groups rebelled and were infiltrated by organizations driven by Islamist ideology with broader jihadist agendas. These transnational jihadist groups did not share the political aspirations of the indigenous groups, and the policies pursued by the intervening force effectively exploited the asymmetrical aspirations. In order to identify the likelihood of achieving a negotiated settlement, the intervening power must recognize the distinction between transnational jihadist groups and local ethnic separatist groups.

The vulnerability of the insurgency is also a function of terrain and disposition. Organizations arrayed in the local context and well-integrated into the community are much less vulnerable to interdiction. It follows that the ethnic separatist movements are more sensitive to maintaining legitimacy and were more willing to negotiate. Transnational movements, such as Al Qaeda in the lands of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM) relied on the tacit and active support of people who viewed them as foreigners. This distinction implies that the tacit support of the population is more tenuous for the transnational group than for the local group, and continued support of the transnational group is a critical vulnerability that the intervening power and the host nation can attack. Intervening forces can effectively exploit insurgent vulnerabilities and drive a wedge between local separatists and transnational terrorist organizations and catalyze resolution of the crisis.

THEORETICAL APPROACH

In order to effectively analyze the role of legitimacy in small footprint interventions, I must first clearly define the term small footprint intervention. An operation

is considered small footprint if the troop commitment is less than two security personnel per 1,000 inhabitants. This is determined by the national population and the total number of troops deployed to the host country. This measurement is drawn from a study conducted by Stephen Watts and Caroline Baxter at RAND Corporation and represents one tenth of the doctrinally prescribed strength of 20 personnel per 1,000 inhabitants.[8] Small footprint operations can consist of active ground combat or they can be purely advisory.

I approached my research by breaking down the factors of analysis into three broad categories: characteristics of the regime, characteristics of the insurgency, and characteristics of the intervention. With respect to the characteristics of the regime, I focus on capacity and legitimacy. To measure capacity, I analyze the ability of the regime to provide basic services and project military power, as well as the resilience of its institutions and the rule of law. I draw on the World Bank's world development indicators to determine the availability of services. For proxy variables, I use kilowatt hours of electricity consumed per capita, percentage of the population with access to improved sanitation and water, and percentage of GDP spent on military expenditures. I approach the analysis of legitimacy from a more qualitative perspective. There are various definitions of legitimacy and consequently a variety of factors can be measured to assess it. Field Manual 3-24, *Insurgency and Counterinsurgency*, defines legitimacy as a society's acceptance of authority consistent with societal norms and values.[9] Paul Miller defines legitimacy similarly as broadly shared notions of justice that enable a state to rest its claims to power on broadly accepted norms.[10] Legitimacy is critical to establish the authority of the

[8] Caroline Baxter et al, *The Uses and Limits of Small-Scale Military Interventions* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2012), 10.
[9] FM 3-24, *Insurgencies and Countering Insurgencies*, (Washington DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army, 2006), 1-8.
[10] Paul Miller, *Armed State Building: Confronting State Failure, 1898-2012*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press (2013) 42-44.

indigenous government, secure cooperation with intervening forces, and develop support for the institutions that will sustain the functions of the government after the departure of the intervening force. Both these definitions provide room for cultural context. It is ultimately the acceptance of a regime that confirms its legitimacy. I measure aspects of political inclusion, to include participation in electoral processes, adherence to formal agreements, and willingness to negotiate with the government as proxies to assess regime legitimacy. I acknowledge that these measures imply notions of legitimacy particular to western liberal democratic values. In these case studies, I believe this is consistent with the above definitions of legitimacy because both regimes possess parliamentary democratic systems of governance.

I analyze insurgencies through two primary factors: a path to negotiated settlement and the vulnerability of the insurgency's resources. To analyze whether there is a path to a negotiated settlement, I analyze the nature of the insurgency itself. While ideological predispositions will necessarily limit the space for political concessions, I distinguish between jihadist movements and primarily political movements. In both case studies, grievances initially rooted in issues of political inclusion and self-determination were later exploited by extremist groups. In both cases, the insurgent groups that expressed these grievances and renounced the broader jihadist agenda were, to a degree, reconciled. In contrast, the primarily jihadist groups espoused demands that rested outside the jurisdiction of the government. Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb and the Abu Sayyaf Group both espouse global jihad and establishment of sharia law. There is no room for reconciliation because the governments in question do not have the authority to grant such concessions without violating their obligation to their citizens.

The second factor of insurgency to analyze is the vulnerability of the insurgency's resources. Terrain and disposition greatly affect whether an insurgency can operate

autonomously. James Fearon and David Laitin argue that the rugged terrain in countries with poorly developed transportation networks, coupled with cross-border sanctuaries, results in conditions that can be exploited effectively by insurgents.[11] The terrain effectively limits the government's ability to influence the population or provide services, resulting in a population that can be exploited by an insurgency for tacit or active support. In this study, I look at the effects of terrain on the insurgent disposition. The strength of the insurgency's network, ability to raise funds, and equip and sustain itself varies among groups.

I analyze interventions through two factors: the role of intervening forces and the role of neighboring states. Small footprint interventions normally relegate the role of the intervening forces to either an observer or trainer role. Either of these roles decreases the likelihood of direct ground combat and emphasizes actions to increase the capacity of the host nation's forces and provide support to operations. Intervening troops may provide specific enabling assets, such as intelligence collection or unmanned drones, provide operational advice, and train the indigenous forces in counterinsurgency and small unit tactics. Intervening forces can also act as the administrator. In this role, the intervening force administers some of the functions of the state directly, such as in unilateral combat operations. As with intervening forces, neighboring states play a critical role in facilitating negotiation and containing the insurgency with aggressive anti-terrorism measures. I look at the history of engagement, and any direct contributions to a negotiated settlement and troop deployments.

Taken together, analysis of these factors provides a contextual overview of conditions under which small footprint interventions can succeed. Chapter two consists of

[11] James Fearon and David Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review*, 97 (1) 2003, 80.

a review of the literature I consulted for this project. In chapter three I present a case study of American intervention in the Philippines. In chapter four, I present a case study of Operation Serval, the French intervention in Mali. I present conclusions and theoretical implications for future operations in chapter five.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

For this research paper, I consulted a broad variety of sources, including foundational works of theory, comprehensive works on state-building and small footprint operations, narrative works detailing the conduct of operations in Mali and the Philippines, and a wide variety of scholarly articles focused on various concepts relevant to my thesis. In this chapter I briefly discuss these works.

DEFINING LEGITIMACY

I relied heavily on the Army and Marine Corps field manual 3-24, *Insurgency and Counterinsurgency*, to understand the concept of legitimacy as understood by the practitioners of small footprint operations. The authors broadly define legitimacy as a society's acceptance of authority consistent with cultural norms and values. The authors point out that legitimacy is the ultimate goal of counterinsurgency. Legitimacy, that is the entity accepted by the people as the legitimate authority, enables control which will eventually enable reconciliation. All authority seeks to control a population through a combination of consent and coercion. The balance between these two elements is determined by norms and values. Conceptions of legitimacy are not static. The concept adapts with a culture and that culture's perceptions of identity. Perceptions of group identity influence perceptions of legitimacy. The authors point out the changes in perceptions of identity following the American Revolution and Germany's wars of unification, and how these wars re-defined notions of legitimate authority in profound ways. In my research, these shifts in perceptions of identity do influence legitimacy. I make observations in both case studies that conform to this understanding. The Army field manual also discusses the actions of an illegitimate government and the over-reliance on

methods of coercion. I draw on this understanding when analyzing the Marcos era in the Philippines.

Robert Egnell's article, "Winning 'Hearts and Minds'? A Critical Analysis of Counter-Insurgency Operations in Afghanistan," questions the western-centric norms of establishing legitimacy through armed intervention. He theorizes that the "hearts and minds" approach is due to a uniquely western conception of the evolution of states. The conception of legitimacy comports well with western norms of political inclusion and securing the consent of the governed, but it fails to recognize that other societies may have other values and norms that place a lesser priority on consent than on respect for traditional authority and religious as well as cultural perceptions of the acceptable use of force. He further hypothesizes that insurgents have a decisive advantage because they are not imposing a foreign concept of legitimacy, but are reinforcing the traditional interpretation. This work has special significance in cultures governed by an ethno-centric moral code, such as the Pashto tradition of Pashtunwali. Egnell effectively argues for the necessity of understanding that the population bestows legitimacy on a government and intervening forces face a steep uphill battle if they intend to impose a foreign concept of legitimate authority. This work further informs the necessity of understanding context and developing operational and strategic objectives with an understanding of the limits imposed by the operational environment.

In *Building Peace After War*, Mats Berdal writes that stability in post-conflict environments cannot be imposed but must be elicited. He articulates legitimacy as the critical component to stabilization. His conception of legitimacy is that it is not a simple calculation or something concrete that can be accrued or quantified. This comports well with the other works I cite in my research, that legitimacy is an abstract but necessary notion. His definition goes on to slightly modify the understanding of legitimacy stated in

the army's field manual by declaring that legitimacy exists through a combination of self-interest and "modes of social control" that can be translated into effective authority. What is most useful in his work is that he articulates the need for two considerations regarding legitimacy: the legitimacy of the intervention and the legitimacy of the host nation's institutions. The emphasis on the legitimacy of the intervention is closely connected to the manner in which force is imposed on a society. The perceptions of the international community matter greatly at the initial stages of the intervention, but as the intervention moves forward, the conduct between the intervening forces and the population takes center stage. He cites American troops repeatedly interfering in the private lives of Iraqis through the imposition of overly aggressive search operations as a leading cause of shifting attitudes among Iraqis. This translates well to understating the Filipino government's refusal to allow foreign troops to participate directly in combat operations and the virtues of the French limiting their role in Mali by incorporating indigenous troops as rapidly as possible. The legitimacy of the institutions empowered by the intervening force is also critical. The structures of governance encouraged, or installed, by intervening forces should be consistent with the values and norms of the people who must consent to its authority. Most importantly, Berdal demonstrates that these twin concepts of legitimacy must be considered at every stage of an operation.

STATE-BUILDING AND COUNTERINSURGENCY THEORY

The foundation for my conception of state building operations is derived from Paul Miller's book, *Armed State-building*. He addresses the various pathologies of state failure and proposes that there is no uniform sequence to be followed. His approach focuses on the correct diagnosis of the contributing causes to state failure and then adapting a strategy appropriate to those failures. He outlines five classifications of state failure: capacity,

prosperity, legitimacy, security, and humanity. While Miller's work does not focus directly on small footprint operations, his classification of state failure and the approaches described can serve as guideposts for determining if a small footprint strategy is feasible. Miller describes the levels of intervention as Observer, Trainer, or Administrator roles. I argue that small footprint interventions can assume any of these three roles. It is not the role assumed that determines success or failure, but the appropriateness of the role. Miller's work provides a sound basis for classifying state failures and forming strategies for intervention that are applicable to small footprint strategies.

In *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, Stephen Watts and a team of RAND researchers evaluate US small footprint operations. The authors identify the current operating environment and recognize the role of counterinsurgency and conclude that this type of warfare is distinct in its context dependence. It is this context dependence that American policymakers should pay attention to, as the researchers present glib data regarding the ability of the United States to influence foreign regimes to adopt strategies consistent with American interests. Specifically, the researchers find that 97% of insurgencies occurring since 1990 are fought by regimes within their own borders. Only 1 in 8 of these regimes possesses the capacity to implement western counterinsurgency practices. In this context, void of interference, these regimes typically do not seek to monopolize the legitimate use of force but seek bounded accommodation. The costs are simply too great for these regimes to dominate a rebellion with force. My thesis builds upon this concept of bounded accommodation by discussing the role of legitimacy in identifying and forcing compliance with negotiated settlements.

The authors discuss government capacity and the potential pitfalls of using this metric to determine the success of an intervention strategy. Specifically, relying on

capacity and urging an incapable regime to undertake measures to improve capacity may cause the regime to stretch beyond its limits and undermine its own credibility. In my research, this exact phenomenon occurs in Mali. The Malian government sought power sharing arrangements that were deliberately inclusive and promised development. The inability of the government to deliver led to further discontent. The illusion of political representation and empty promises acted as one of the primary catalysts of the rebellion. In this sense, the authors model predicted government behavior.

This work includes a case study of the Philippines upon which I heavily draw to outline the course of events. The relationship between state capacity, counterinsurgency approach, and the response of the insurgency is confirmed by other articles and reports consulted. The government in Manila closely follows the hypothesis with the evolution of its various strategies coinciding with improvements in capacity. My contribution to this research is that legitimacy goes beyond political inclusion to include the diplomatic and military efforts of foreign actors.

In *The Uses and Limits of Small-Scale Military Interventions*, Caroline Baxter et al. argue that the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan have caused policymakers and military professionals to look for other methods of intervention. The small footprint approach appeals for three reasons. First, these interventions are more cost effective. Critics point out that the US spent approximately $100 billion per year in Afghanistan to eliminate a small portion of Al Qaeda fighters in a country with an annual GDP of $14 billion. Defense spending will always be in competition with domestic requirements and large scale operations with limited prospects for success are easily criticized. Second, smaller interventions are less likely to result in a nationalist backlash. Third, small footprint interventions are less likely to result in a relationship of dependence. The opposing

arguments are that small footprint operations will not exert effective control over indigenous allies and small interventions risk future expansion as failures mount.

The authors theorize that operations in the developing world, particularly those occurring in failed or failing states, may often come down to a question of will. The defeat of such insurgencies does not necessarily occur inside the defined power dynamic that plays to American strength, in fact it frequently devolves to insurgent will dictating the uses of American power. In this case, strength alone cannot be considered to guarantee success and the failure of strong western powers to recognize this dynamic may explain how David is able to defeat Goliath. This theoretical contribution influences my thesis that legitimacy, in all its abstraction, is often the goal identified by western counterinsurgents. Those engaging in counterinsurgency would do well to recognize the absolute necessity of hard power and its contextual limitations and asymmetries.

The study provides an elaborate discussion of the factors that influence the strategic approaches available to various regimes. Regimes that are less capable, less accountable, and less politically inclusive are much more likely to resort to violence. These regimes, lacking capacity to prosecute a western counterinsurgency model, ultimately erode legitimacy through these types of actions. I rely heavily on this work for the discussion of the Philippines, as the researchers' thesis bears out in that conflict.

Perhaps the most significant contribution of this work to my research is the systematic and thorough quantitative analysis of small footprint operations. The authors define the operational environments in which interventions have historically occurred and conclude that the size of the intervention is correlated with its environmental complexity. Lastly, the authors assert that small footprint stability operations lead to a denial of victory or negotiated settlement, but do not necessarily increase the odds of a military victory for the counterinsurgents.

The authors conclude with three recommendations for improving the probability of success. First, circumstances matter. The United States, despite its vast power differential, cannot guarantee victory in every circumstance. This comports well with my thesis regarding the need for third party interventions to seek regional powers to enhance their own legitimacy and to approach the war with an understanding of its inherently political nature. Intervening powers cannot impose their will to achieve unconditional ends. War is participation in a political process that creates conditions for a negotiation that may bring about a more stable peace. Second, small footprint operations must be combined with the other tools of statecraft. Diplomacy, economic incentives or sanctions, and military action should be united in a common effort. My thesis goes beyond this to include the need for third party participation and legitimation. Finally, intervening forces must be committed to stabilizing the peace. Interventions, small footprint or otherwise, cannot succeed if the intervening powers are not willing to engage in the process and do what must be done. War is the unknown environment being continuously influenced by factors which may be unknowable. Success requires unwavering commitment.

THE PHILIPPINES

In *The Evolving Terrorist Threat in Southeast Asia*, Peter Chalk leads a team of RAND researchers to conduct a thorough analysis of various terrorist organizations operating in Southeast Asia. I draw on this research to better understand the composition and disposition of these elements. The study provides data on the various organizations vying for power in the Philippines and Indonesia, and discusses the origins of the Abu Sayaaf Group as well as the evolution of the Moro National Liberation Front into the Moro Islamic Liberation Front. The researchers detail the domestic situation and the sources of support, as well as the shifting loyalties and the effectiveness of the Filipino armed forces

operating in conjunction with the US military. This work informs my theory of how insurgencies are ideologically guided, how this is balanced with economic and diplomatic concerns, and how these organizations array themselves in time and space. The authors provide a detailed account of perceptions in the communities in which these insurgencies operate, and this is critical to understanding the vulnerability of an insurgency. My discussion of the vulnerability of resources to interdiction is greatly informed by the understanding of how terror organizations in Southeast Asia are deliberately arrayed to remain outside the effective jurisdiction of the Filipino government.

Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines provides a series of essays by prominent Filipino insurgent and government leaders who participated in the peace process. This document provides much of the history of the crisis in the Philippines. It begins with the Marcos era and ends with a framework resolution for peace. I draw on this document to discuss the effectiveness of diplomacy. This work supports my thesis regarding the significance of outside actors. The peace process entailed in this document occurred in Tripoli and Malaysia and provides a detailed account of the diplomatic hurdles that were overcome to bring these groups together. These authors conclude that the promising peace agreement coincides with the first time in history that the United States has led the international community to take a firm stance on the question of Moro autonomy in the Philippines. This work also reveals the highly pragmatic and political nature of the Moro separatist movement and demonstrates the limits of pure ideology. Moro separatists did find allegiance with more ideologically driven transnational insurgent factions, but these were alliances of convenience that were rapidly dissolved when a truly promising prospect of peace emerged.

MALI AND OPERATION SERVAL

In *The French War on Al Qa-ida in Africa*, Steve Chivvis argues on behalf of the effectiveness of the French strategy. The French intervention, consisting of roughly 4,500 French soldiers initially, deployed on extremely short notice and moved directly into combat against Islamist forces in northern Mali. He argues that the French acceptance of risk and maintenance of a high operational tempo were critical to the success of the operation, which succeeded in restoring Mali's territorial integrity and put the insurgents to flight rather quickly. I rely heavily on Chivvis's work to provide the timeline and details of the French intervention.

Chivvis also discusses the French regional strategy. Inside Mali, the French deployed a comprehensive military effort that included airborne assaults that seized airfields, special operations forces that struck Al Qaeda targets, and conventional forces that secured major population centers and conducted large scale clearance operations to destroy what remained of the insurgency. Despite the comprehensive nature of the military action, French diplomatic efforts ensured that France would not be solely responsible for the administration of the peace. The United Nations provided a peacekeeping force consisting of African soldiers from neighboring states. The EU committed to a long-term police and military training program designed to increase the capacity of Mali, and the French have been able to withdraw significantly from Mali and maintain a broader regional strategy of containment.

Chivvis's work informs my thesis regarding the role of neighboring states and the role that the intervening forces will fulfill. Regional diplomacy ensured that other African nations engaged in direct combat side by side with French soldiers, and the consensus developed into a long-term commitment to eradicating extremist organizations from North Africa. These efforts led to success in Mali and provide a model that can be adapted,

context dependent, to other interventions. Mali is undoubtedly safer than it would be without the French intervention, and the intervention with a deliberate exit strategy prevented a quagmire and preserved French legitimacy for future operations throughout the wider region.

In addition to Chivvis, French Lieutenant General Olivier Tramond and Lieutenant Colonel Philippe Seigneur authored an article in *Military Review* titled, "Operation Serval: Another Beau Geste of France in Sub-Saharan Africa?" The authors provide an overview of French operations in Mali from the French operational perspective. I rely on this source for the French operational details and to provide additional context.

In "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: The Malian Crisis," Djallil Lounnas writing in the *Journal of North African Studies* reveals the significance of Algeria's role in the French intervention in Mali. The author outlines the importance of this relationship in facilitating and legitimating the French intervention. Algeria's contributions were critical to success for four reasons. First, Algeria understands AQIM and has a long history of successfully containing the terrorist group. AQIM originated in Algeria and the Algerian government prosecuted a regional strategy that effectively contained AQIM for years until the Arab Spring weakened Algeria's previously cooperative neighbors. Second, Algeria had legitimacy with the Malian government and the various factions competing for power in the ungoverned spaces of northern Mali. The various factions had been engaged in Algerian hosted negotiations just prior to the intervention. The Algerians astutely parsed the aspirations of ethnic Tuaregs from the more threatening regional and global agendas of more extreme groups. Third, Algeria is viewed as a competent and valuable regional partner. Algeria emerged from the Arab Spring with its government intact and functional. It is undoubtedly a developing state, but the crises of legitimacy that plagued the rest of the region seemed to bypass the Algerian government. Finally, the history between France and

Algeria places Algeria in a unique position to legitimize French intervention. Algerian condemnation of the intervention could have eroded French legitimacy. The acquiescence and cooperation of the Algerians strengthened French claims to legitimacy. This work is consistent with my thesis that legitimacy, in all its abstraction, can be generated in a variety of ways. In Mali, the host nation government suffered from a crisis of legitimacy that has been temporarily allayed by the actions of capable and legitimate neighbors and backed by French military superiority.

Chapter 3: Philippines – Case Study

Those in the defense and military establishment who advocate for a small footprint approach to stability operations frequently cite American intervention in the Philippines as a model for wider implementation. The strategy in the Philippines consisted of a small contingent of Americans, mostly Special Operations Forces, that built the capacity of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP), conducted civil-military operations that included medical civil action programs and minor infrastructural improvements to build trust between the people and the AFP, and conducted information operations to influence the population in favor of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP).[12] The appeal of this operation is the limited cost in terms of blood and treasure and the empowerment of the GRP to conduct its own war.

This intervention is significant for many reasons. First, it is an example of a successful small footprint operation. The operation is consistent with the doctrine of foreign internal defense (FID) that directs every action be conducted by, with, and through the host nation government and security forces. Second, the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) is a democratic government with western institutions and norms of oversight, a restrained executive, and a capable military establishment. These factors predispose the GRP to conduct counterinsurgency in a manner that is consistent with Western norms.[13] Third, the threat in the Philippines is multi-faceted and characterized by divergent interests ranging from territorial autonomy to the establishment of a theocratic state.[14] The diplomatic and military navigation of these competing interests can provide

[12] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF-Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review* 86 (2006): 8-11

[13] Stephen E Watts et al., *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2014), 25

[14] Peter Chalk et al., *The Evolving Terrorist Threat to Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2009), 50

insight for the settlement of future conflicts. Finally, the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) failed to establish itself as legitimate through its own actions, but over time the increased capacity of the regime and outsourcing of negotiations to neighboring states significantly improved the GRP's prospects of establishing broadly shared norms of justice. The primary insurgent actor, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front, also elicited the assistance of an external actor to further legitimize the peace process. This case study establishes both the importance of understanding context and the central role of legitimacy in securing a negotiated resolution to hostilities.

The success of this operation was highly contingent on the characteristics of the state and the threat. In *Countering Other's Insurgencies*, RAND researchers determine that the ideal conditions for successful operations, such as host nation government capacity, political inclusion, and professional military capability, were prevalent in the Philippines.[15] The authors also comment that the circumstances in the Philippines have rarely been replicated in the history of American small footprint operations, and it is a mistake to assume that the success of this operation directly translates to success in less promising environments. In this case study, I intend to analyze the characteristics of the governing regime, the threat, and the intervention to clearly identify the centrality of legitimacy as well as the context that enabled success in the Philippines.

BACKGROUND

Islamic separatist movements in the Philippines and the actions of the Government of the Republic of the Philippines (GRP) can be understood in three distinct phases. First, the election of Ferdinand Marcos and his subsequent declaration of martial law in 1972 reveal a heavy-handed militaristic approach to counterinsurgency. This approach is

[15] Stephen E Watts et al., *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2014), 173-4.

indicative of a regime that lacks the capacity to deliver services, train an adequate military force, prosecute a competent counterinsurgency strategy, and the legitimacy to act in good faith to compel a negotiated settlement. Second, the subsequent administrations of Corazon Aquino and Fidel Ramos indicate a shift in strategy to adopt a more conciliatory approach. Aquino would articulate a multi-phased counterinsurgency strategy that closely resembles the American "Clear, Hold, Build" model. She would also offer amnesty and reintegration for Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) fighters as a conciliatory effort.[16] Despite her attempts at reintegrating Muslim separatists, the lasting memory of martial law under Marcos, combined with an inability of the government to deliver the services and development, undermined her efforts. Fidel Ramos would extend Aquino's programs of amnesty and reintegration and in 1992 he secured an agreement with the MNLF that did remove some military forces from the battlefield. Despite this early success, the Ramos regime would inherit the bureaucratic inefficiency and corruption that limited the effectiveness of the Aquino regime's counterinsurgency strategy. It was also during Ramos's term that the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG) became more influential, as the reintegration incentives appealed mostly to the MNLF leadership and left the more hardline Islamists to seek another venue for Moro independence.[17] Third, the GRP strategy from 2001 to the present date can be described as an implementation of a classical counterinsurgency model. As the GRP improved in capacity, legitimacy, and military competence, the subsequent regimes, in coordination with the United States, have heavily invested in development and civil-military

[16] Gareth Porter, "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines: Aquino was Right," *SAIS Review* 7 (1987): 93.
[17] Rizal C. Buendia, "The GRP-MILF Peace Talks: Quo Vadis?" *Southeast Asian Affairs* (2004): 206.

operations.[18] This approach has led to a promising peace agreement with the MILF and reduction in the effectiveness of the ASG.

1965-1986, Martial Law and the Rise of the Moro National Liberation Front

The seeds of conflict between the Roman Catholic majority in the Philippines and the Islamic Moro minority, residing primarily in the south, were planted centuries ago. Two factors influenced the direction of Moro relations with the GRP during the Marcos regime. First, the alleged execution of Muslim Filipino army recruits on Corregidor island in what came to be known as the Jabidah Massacre. Second, the Ilaga movement, a Christian militia group, that committed acts of harassment and terror against Muslims in Mindanao. This group reportedly executed 65 men, women, and children in a mosque in June of 1971.[19]

The violence against Muslims in Mindanao and elsewhere awakened the collective consciousness of Muslim Filipinos and drove many young Muslim men into the arms of the Moro National Liberation Front.[20] The increase in support for the MNLF, as well as the communist insurgency raging elsewhere in the Philippines, led Ferdinand Marcos to declare a state of martial law in 1972, effectively installing himself as a dictator. He would rule the Philippines until his ouster in 1986.

President Marcos' approach to counterinsurgency was predictably heavy handed. He expanded the size of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) from 60,000 to 157,000. His regime lacked the administrative capacity and legitimacy to secure a negotiated settlement and subsequently focused on coercion and force, which further eroded the regime's legitimacy. The actions of the regime would indicate little interest in

[18] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 105.

[19] Pamela Fabe Amparo, "The Cost of Terrorism: Bombings by the Abu Sayyaf Group in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review*, 61, 1 (2013): 233

[20] Al-Haj Murad Ebrahim et al., "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," *Asian Politics and Policy* 5, 4 (2013): 631

reconciliation or negotiated settlements of any kind.[21] In his war against the MNLF, Marcos employed the professional Filipino forces as well as poorly trained militias. From 1969-1976, these actions resulted in approximately 60,000 killed, 54,000 wounded, and as many as 350,000 displaced.[22] Marcos's war against the Muslim population was not strictly military, he also attempted to marginalize Muslim influence in Mindanao by encouraging Christians to purchase land, settle in Mindanao, start businesses, and run for office in an attempt to relegate the Moro people to minority status in their ancestral homeland.[23] Marcos also controlled the political elections in Mindanao and, in some cases, disempowered incumbent Muslim leaders and installed Christian officers in their stead.[24]

Fighting between the Marcos regime and the MNLF temporarily ceased as a result of the 1977 Tripoli agreement, whereby the GRP acknowledged the Moro right to self-determination and both parties agreed to settle the issue of autonomy by referendum at a later date.[25] The agreement was not adhered to by either the MNLF or the GRP, it was abandoned and fighting resumed.[26] Mutual suspicion and distrust, a result of the violation of societal norms of justice, then undermined the foundation of legitimate government action and increased the difficulty that both the MNLF and GRP faced in securing adherence to the peace agreement. Disagreement over the outcome of the Tripoli peace talks led to a split within the ranks of the MNLF. Many MNLF members viewed the delay of the question of autonomy as a betrayal to the cause of Moro independence. Mistrust

---

[21] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 81.
[22] Ibid. 82
[23] Ibid
[24] Ebrahim, "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," 630.
[25] Ibid. 635
[26] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 81.

between MNLF members who were willing to settle and those who believed the GRP could not be trusted led to the foundation of the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) in 1984.

1986-2001, Reconciliation and Discontent

In 1986, with the election of Corazon Aquino as President of the Philippines, the prospects for a negotiated settlement between the MNLF and the GRP greatly improved. Aquino pursued a conciliatory strategy and offered terms of reintegration and amnesty to MNLF members who were willing to lay down their weapons. Aquino's counterinsurgency strategy consisted of a greater emphasis on delivering services, economic development, and winning the support of the people in addition to intelligence driven combat operations. Additionally, the AFP underwent training that emphasized human rights and population centric operations. In practice, this renewed emphasis on classical counterinsurgency fell short of expectations. The GRP lacked much of the necessary administrative capacity to deliver on the promises of development, and intelligence driven operations were more wishful thinking than reality given the scarce resources of the AFP.[27]

In 1989, the Aquino government reached an agreement to create the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) through a referendum in the affected provinces in accordance with the 1977 Tripoli agreement. The referendum had poor results, with only four of the thirteen provinces electing to participate in the ARMM. The memory of Ferdinand Marcos's martial law caused many Muslims to harbor significant skepticism towards the Manila regime.[28] Muslim discontent with the MNLF is expressed during this period with the rise in the prevalence of the more extreme separatist movements, the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) and the Abu Sayyaf Group (ASG). The MILF swelled to an estimated 11,000-15,000 fighters armed with 7,700 weapons, to include rifles, grenade

[27] Ibid, 85.
[28] Ibid, 89.

launchers, machine guns, anti-tank munitions, and anti-personnel land mines.[29] The ASG was founded during this period by Khadaffi Janjalani in response to the softening stance of the MNLF and the MILF.[30] Janjalani traveled extensively throughout the Arab world and was educated in Saudi Arabia. He was also a personal friend of Osama Bin Laden and a participant in the Afghan campaign against the Soviets. He intended to bring Wahabbist zeal to the Moro movement in South East Asia.[31] During this period, the ASG was responsible for 378 terrorist attacks that killed 288 civilians and kidnapped 2,076 people for ransom.

In 1998, Fidel Ramos was replaced by Joseph Estrada, who delegated responsibility for the overall strategy to the Filipino armed forces. In 2000, Estrada declared war against the MILF leading to significant displacement of persons and a reversion to the fighting of previous administrations.[32] Ramos undermined the previous administration's attempts to reintegrate reconcilable Moros.

2001-Present, Classical Counterinsurgency and American Assistance

Estrada was deposed in 2001 and Gloria Arroyo, the Vice President, assumed the position of President of the Philippines. Presidential elections were held in 2004 and 2010 and peaceful transitions of power eventually became normalized, boding well for the adoption of more population-centric counterinsurgency measures. The GRP committed to a negotiated settlement with the MILF but considered the ASG a terrorist organization and did not offer amnesty or reintegration to the ASG.[33]

---

[29] Peter Chalk et al., *The Evolving Terrorist Threat to Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment*, 42.
[30] Rommel C. Banlaoi, "The Abu Sayyaf Group: From Mere Banditry to Genuine Terrorism." *Southeast Asian Affairs* (2006): 251.
[31] Ibid.
[32] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 90.
[33] Ibid, 91

During this period, the United States considered the Philippines a front in the Global War on Terror. American involvement was relegated to the southern Philippines and focused primarily on targeting the ASG and American interests in the War on Terror. US forces are still forbidden to participate in ground combat, but they were instrumental in providing intelligence support and training to the AFP. The American presence coincided with a greater emphasis on human rights, protection of civilians, development, and precision targeting of insurgent personnel and resources. These operations have been highly successful, reducing the strength of the ASG to approximately 250 fighters and creating the conditions for a lasting peace with the MILF.[34]

ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT

Small footprint interventions are more likely to succeed if the intervention can generate legitimacy for the state without undermining its precarious position. Because capacity and legitimacy are linked, I consider both here. In the case of the Philippines, there is significant improvement in both capacity and legitimacy throughout the various administrations, and these improvements coincide with shifts in the strategy pursued.

Capacity

Per capita electric power consumption measures the amount of electricity consumed by the population. This includes electricity that is generated locally for domestic consumption as well as for manufacturing and industry. Higher consumption indicates improvement in the quality of life, and greater governmental capacity to manage, construct, and collect payments for energy consumed. During the Marcos era, electric power consumption averaged 325 kilowatt hours per person. In the time period from 1986-2001, consumption increased to 396 kilowatt hours per person. The average for the last period

[34] Ibid, 104

under consideration, 2001 to the present, consumption has skyrocketed to 602 kilowatt hours per person.[35]

The percentage of the population with access to improved sanitation and water sources has undergone similar changes over the periods in question. From 1986-2001 the average percentage of the population with access to improved sanitation was 60.8% while in the latest era, 2001 to the present, this number has increased to 69%. Likewise, for access to clean water the numbers have increased from 85.6% to 89.7%.[36] While specific data for these two indicators is not available for the first period under consideration, overall poverty data is. The poverty headcount ratio measures the percentage of the population that lived on less than $1.90 per day. For the Marcos era, 28.08% of the population lived at or below this measure. This number was reduced to 22.5% from 1986-2001 and has taken an even more dramatic reduction in the last period to 14.59%.[37] This measure doesn't illuminate government capacity with regard to services delivered, but it does provide an understanding of the improved standards of living.

The final indicator for capacity measures the percentage of GDP spent on military hardware and personnel. During the Marcos regime, this data is not available. Though we do know that he increased the size of the Filipino military dramatically, from 60,000 to more than 150,000, and his regime was actively involved in a costly and brutal war. A study commissioned by the RAND corporation states that military spending under Marcos peaked in 1982 at $909,000,000, which was 14 times the amount spent on military expenditures during Marcos' first year in office.[38] For the period from 1986 to 2001, the

---

[35] World Bank World Development Indicators, http://www.iea.org/stats/index.asp
[36] WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation (http://www.wssinfo.org/).
[37] Ibid.
[38] Watts et al., *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 93.

GRP spent 2.007% of GDP on military expenditures compared to just 1.29% for the last era. This decrease in military spending as a percentage of GDP must be taken in light of the economic growth during this period. Nonetheless, the burden of maintaining a military was reduced which allowed for greater spending on domestic affairs. This reduction in the burden imposed by military spending also came at a time when the AFP was focused on a classical counterinsurgency campaign built on a model that was recognizable to western powers. The AFP have been augmented with American intelligence collection capabilities as well as training. The AFP also abandoned their previous attempts to coerce the insurgents, and embraced a philosophy of development and security. The force was better trained, more appropriately equipped, and more cost effective than it was during the Marcos era.

Legitimacy

The legitimacy of the ruling regime is difficult to assess. Marcos's actions against the Islamic south, political gerrymandering in Catobato and his attempts to manipulate the demography of the Moro region empowered the growth of the MNLF and exacerbated historic ethnic tensions in a manner that would take decades of diplomatic work to correct.[39] For an ostensibly democratic regime to be considered legitimate, there must be a reasonable belief in executive restraint, political inclusion, and resilient institutions. Dictatorships that lack capacity and rule of law are rarely considered legitimate, and this lack of legitimacy limits policy options and frequently results in greater atrocity and further reductions of legitimacy.[40] The restoration of legitimacy in the Philippines brought the MILF to negotiate with the GRP. This was achieved through concerted diplomatic efforts of Marcos's successors.

[39] Ibid.
[40] Ibid.

Marcos's attempt at legitimacy culminated in the Tripoli talks in 1976, whereby the GRP acknowledged the Moro right to self-determination.[41] The agreement fell apart almost immediately, as the MNLF and the GRP both violated the terms of the agreement. The mistrust between the Moro people and the GRP led to the rejection of the Tripoli agreement and the broad acceptance of a more radical organization. The MILF was officially founded in 1984 to fulfill the vision of an Islamic state in South East Asia. Hashim Salamat, one of the founding leaders of the MILF is quoted as saying, "autonomy will not work . . . It will only be manipulated and controlled by the Manila government . . . Only the full independence of the Bangsamoro people with an Islamic state will solve the problems of Mindanao."[42] The illegitimacy of the actions of the GRP led to a deep mistrust that prevented a rapprochement and led to further radicalization that would bedevil multiple GRP administrations.

President Corazon Aquino assumed office in 1986 and sought to reinvigorate negotiations with the Muslim separatist groups in the south. She offered promises of reintegration and amnesty to MNLF fighters. Legitimacy is not solely a measure of the president's willingness to negotiate, it is also the people's perceptions of the institutions that will carry out her orders. In the case of president Aquino, the military still had many officers loyal to the policies of Marcos, and she made little headway in her attempts to negotiate.[43] She saw this failure, and initiated reforms within the military and the supporting institutions, but it would take time to establish the trust necessary for a meaningful negotiation. In order for norms of justice to be realized, and broadly shared, a

[41] Al-Haj Murad Ebrahim et al., "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," *Asian Politics and Policy* 5, 4 (2013): 632.
[42] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 37.
[43] Ibid, 83.

consistent pattern of government behavior must predictably conform to culturally appropriate norms of justice. Aquino did, however, succeed in pushing forward the referendum on the Autonomous Region of Muslim Mindanao (ARMM) but, due to the previously stated lack of trust, only four of the thirteen eligible provinces and cities voted in favor.[44] Furthermore, at the time the plebiscite was conducted, violations of the Libya cease-fire agreement between the MNLF and the government were occurring with increased regularity and there were multiple coup plots against the Aquino administration.[45] This overture, and subsequent rejection by the Moro people, indicate the importance of trust and credible belief in the ability of the established powers to deliver on negotiated settlements. The insurgents had little reason to find Aquino credible.

Fidel Ramos ascended to the presidency in 1992 and continued Aquino's policies of reconciliation, but took greater efforts to increase the legitimacy of his government. He did two things immediately to repair the damaged reputation of the government. First, he repealed an anti-subversion law to enable previously identified "subversive" organizations to pursue their social and political aims in a non-violent manner.[46] This legislation had previously been a roadblock to progress. Despite the lofty rhetoric of president Aquino, this anti-subversion legislation empowered the institutions of the government to interpret prior actions as subversive and this blocked the participation of many who desired sincere reconciliation. Second, he created a program to reintegrate and disarm former rebels.[47] This program allowed former MNLF fighters to exchange their weapons for money and participate in job-training and other livelihood enhancing programs. These proposals

[44] Ibid, 86.
[45] Jacques Bertrand, "Peace and Conflict in the Southern Philippines: Why the 1996 Peace Agreement is Fragile," *Pacific Affairs* 73 (2000): 39-40.
[46] Watts, *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 87.
[47] Ibid, 88.

secured a negotiated settlement with the MNLF in 1996, "The Final Mindanao Peace Agreement," that broke a decades long diplomatic impasse.[48] Despite these successes, the institutions and bureaucracy of his government were still perceived as weak, corrupt, and inefficient, and while the MNLF and the NPA (Communists) negotiated, or were thwarted, the more extreme elements of the Muslim separatist Moro movement continued to thrive and refused to accept the government's overtures as sincere. During his tenure, the MILF and the ASG both increased in numbers and influence in Mindanao.[49]

The progress of Aquino and Ramos was largely reversed by Ramos's successor, Joseph Estrada, who escalated combat operations against the Moro separatists, which led to significant civilian casualties and displacement of hundreds of thousands of Filipinos.[50] He gravely miscalculated the center of gravity with his scorched earth tactics, and empowered the MILF and the ASG by driving moderate Muslims in Mindanao into the arms of extremists.[51] The delicate work of establishing the regime's legitimacy was recklessly undermined by a return to hostilities, confirming the suspicions of the more extreme elements and isolating the moderate insurgent leaders who sought a genuine reconciliation.

In 2001, the people deposed Estrada in a popular uprising and replaced him with the Vice President, Gloria Arroyo. Arroyo understood the significance of legitimacy in her actions and in the actions of the institutions of power. Estrada's fall from grace drove this point home, as it was the accusations of rampant corruption and incompetence that caused the loss of confidence and ultimately led to his ouster. She was determined to seek a new

[48] Ibid, 87.
[49] Ibid, 89.
[50] Ibid, 90.
[51] Al-Haj Murad Ebrahim et al., "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," 635.

course for the negotiations with insurgent groups. Recognizing the crisis of credibility, she appealed to Malaysia, a Muslim majority country, to mediate the peace talks with the MILF. The initial response was promising, as both the AFP and the MILF suspended military actions in good faith on April 3, 2001.[52] This decision acknowledges that the suspicion and distrust that insurgent groups harbored toward the GRP was legitimate, and by appealing to Malaysia, the GRP provided a degree of separation from the peace process that demonstrated sincerity. The GRP could not legitimize itself because the relationship was too precarious and fraught with a history of mistrust and skepticism. Malaysia was critical to legitimizing the peace process.

The advent of the War on Terror introduced a new dynamic to the peace negotiations. Opportunistic MILF leadership recognized American involvement in the War on Terror as an opportunity to secure the support of a major western power as a method to pressure the GRP to make meaningful concessions. The MILF moderated its call for full independence, and adopted a more conciliatory tone, appealing to President George W. Bush directly in a letter composed in January, 2003, extolling the United States as a "great champion of freedom and democracy" and committed to a negotiated settlement with Washington at the table. The MILF later fully renounced the use of terrorism in this letter.[53] These actions were noticed in Washington, and President Bush would recount his correspondence with the MILF leadership at an address he delivered to the Filipino congress. These events taken together, the introduction of a neutral third party sympathetic to the insurgency, and the interest of a high-profile western partner, the United States, led

[52] Ibid, 636.

[53] Peter Chalk et al., *The Evolving Terrorist Threat to Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment* (Santa Monica: RAND Corporation, 2009) 38.

to a series of talks that resulted in a framework agreement and a negotiated settlement.[54] Peace in the southern Philippines looks more promising now than at any time in the last 40 years.

These factors taken together indicate a government that was progressing towards greater capacity and legitimacy. During the Marcos era, the government lacked the ability to deliver services and this coincided with the movement towards dictatorship and heavy handed counterinsurgency strategy. The subsequent efforts at political inclusion of the insurgent groups required both the institutional capacity to deliver services and manage the affairs of state as well as the ability to build trust and confidence in the intentions of the government and its institutions. It was ultimately the influence of the United States and Malaysia that ensured the legitimacy of the GRP's peace process. Malaysia acted as an impartial mediator and the United States was leveraged by the MILF to ensure the good behavior of the GRP. All told, as capacity and legitimacy increased, the country moved towards a western counterinsurgency model and abandoned the more authoritarian practices of the Marcos era. Because the regime was sufficiently capable and perceived as legitimate, the modest contributions of the US intervention were highly effective at isolating and destroying the narrow extremist elements by, with, and through the GRP.

ANALYSIS OF THE INSURGENCY

I analyze two specific questions regarding the insurgency itself. First, for small footprint operations to be a viable option there must be an apparent path to a negotiated settlement. The concept of legitimacy, previously applied to the regime, applies to the insurgency as well. The MILF insurgency exercised control over military forces and governance, and the ability to enforce adherence to cease-fire agreements, censure rogue

[54] Al-Haj Murad Ebrahim et al., "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," 636-8.

elements, and organize operations indicates that the MILF capitalized on shared norms of justice within the Moro community to enhance its own legitimacy.

As a matter of strategy, the government and the intervening force should seek to distinguish between reconcilable and irreconcilable insurgents to identify this path to negotiation. In the case of the Philippines, this was a key component of the GRP strategy. The GRP and the intervening US forces effectively targeted the extremist elements of the insurgency and increased the space for negotiation and reconciliation.[55] Second, insurgent vulnerability to interdiction is determined by disposition and terrain. In the case of the Philippines, the terrain favored the insurgency because the restrictive nature of the terrain denied government influence and strengthened the ties between the MILF and the Moro people.[56] MILF disposition exploited the advantages of terrain and the disposition of forces made this advantage concrete by allowing the MILF to solidify control and reduce the influence of transnational forces with aspirations beyond Moro independence.

The American intervention in the Philippines is concerned primarily with two insurgent elements, the MILF and the ASG. These two insurgencies have at times cooperated, though their intentions and aspirations differ significantly. For this reason, they will each be dealt with separately here.

The Moro Islamic Liberation Front

The MILF path to a negotiated settlement is observable for three distinct reasons. First, the movement is primarily an ethnic movement concerned with legitimate grievances regarding the right to self-determination. While other groups have temporarily allied themselves with the MILF, such as the ASG or the MBG, the MILF has continuously

[55] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review*, 86 (2006): 8-9.
[56] James Fearon and David Laitin, "Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War," *American Political Science Review* 97 (1) 2003: 80.

prioritized the immediate political goals of independence for the Moro people. Second, the movement is perceived by its adherents as largely legitimate. The MILF commands significant respect among the people of Mindanao and is rooted in a tradition of ethnic and religious solidarity. The legitimacy of this movement can be observed by the consistent unwillingness to involve itself in transnational matters and the tacit and active support of the Moro people during times of conflict. The organization has generally refrained from terrorist tactics and the targeting of civilians or critical infrastructure, which increases their legitimate appeal beyond the Moro ethnic group.[57] The organization also possesses significant military credibility, as evidenced by the 11,000 Moro men at arms and a significant arsenal that has proven capable of continuous guerrilla warfare against a superior force.[58] This military strength also indicates an acceptance of legitimate use of force by the Moro people. Third, the movement has a history of diplomatic concessions to secure more favorable outcomes.[59] The organization emerged in response to the brutal execution of Muslims and did not waver in the insistence of a permanent political solution. Although the aspirations migrated from autonomy, to full independence, to an eventual acceptance of autonomy, these diplomatic shifts should be understood in light of the actions of the GRP and not as unilateral political adjustments on behalf of the MILF. When conditions enabled diplomatic concessions, the MILF proved to be diplomatically astute.[60]

The vulnerability of MILF resources to interdiction can be understood by the following observations. First, the geography of the southern Philippines. The Philippine archipelago presents many obstacles to the full exercise of sovereignty by the GRP, and

---

[57] Peter Chalk et al., *The Evolving Terrorist Threat to Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment*, 42.
[58] Ibid.
[59] Anisseh Van Engeland et al. *From Terrorism to Politics*. (Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 2008), 200-3. Accessed April 21, 2017. ProQuest Ebook Central.
[60] Ibid, 204.

this provided a comparative advantage to the insurgent group.[61] The MILF had established 14 separate base commands throughout Mindanao and had access to their own strategically placed weapons caches.[62] The difficulty of the terrain results in a relative parity of capabilities that cannot be overcome by the GRP without significant advantages in intelligence and precision targeting. It is arguable that the strength of the MILF geographic position placed the MILF in a stronger negotiating position due to the inability of the GRP to interdict the group's resources. This may explain the relative staying power of the MILF and the MNLF, as these organizations occupy territory that is beyond the capacity of the GRP to control. Second, the localization of the movement and the refusal to be coopted by a broader transnational organization limits the movement of resources from abroad and forces self-reliance or reliance on the immediate resources available within the community. MILF leadership proved to be pragmatic and focused on political and economic reform at the expense of adopting a jihadist agenda that would have secured international support. Pragmatism may limit the potential for transnational support, but it strengthened the organization's most vital support systems and shielded its resources from interdiction.

Insurgencies such as the MILF are well suited to small footprint intervention. In the case of the MILF, modest training and enhanced capabilities, as well as diplomatic pressure on both sides of the conflict, led to significant results with relatively little blood or treasure expended. The legitimacy of the grievances, the credibility of the MILF in controlling the actions of its members, and the established history of diplomatic engagement are all promising signs that minimal diplomatic pressure and military assistance can deliver a modest course correction.

---

[61] Watts et al., *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 97.

[62] Peter Chalk et al., *The Evolving Terrorist Threat to Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment*, 41.

The Abu Sayyaf Group

The ASG does not appear to have a path to a negotiated settlement, nor does the organization appear to seek one. Then, as now, the goal of the ASG is to establish an Islamic state in the Philippines, ruled by Sharia Law.[63] The absence of a path to settlement is apparent for three reasons. First, the ASG is primarily a jihadist movement. Although the ASG has found common cause with the MILF and the MNLF for action in the past, it cannot be said that the ASG is in agreement with the MILF acceptance of a political resolution. The ASG simply does not have the combat power or political influence to direct the discourse, which is why the ASG has resorted to more dramatic acts of terrorism. Second, the adherents of the ASG are only loosely connected and the organization lacks influence over its own members. In *Assessing the Abu Sayyaf Group's Strategic and Learning Capabilities*, Luke Gerdes et. al conclude that the ASG membership is so convoluted and decentralized that members who gather together to conduct an operation frequently compete with one another rather than cooperate.[64] There is a significant contrast between the broad grassroots support of the MILF and the ad hoc nature of the ASG. It is unlikely that the ASG, even if it articulated a vision that allowed for a political resolution, could ever compel the adherents of the group to comply. The ASG simply lacks the legitimacy of the MILF. Third, the ASG has a history of conducting terrorist attacks and provides no reason to assume that concessions will be made. The aspirations of the group are not self-determination or a response to injustice. The ASG aspires to impose a Wahabbist style theocracy and is not interested in concessions.[65]

---

[63] Anisseh Van Engeland et al. *From Terrorism to Politics*. (Abingdon: Taylor and Francis, 2008), 206.
[64] Luke M. Gerdes et al., "Assessing the Abu Sayyaf Group's Strategic and Learning Capacities." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 37 (2014): 270.
[65] Rommel C. Banlaoi, "The Abu Sayyaf Group: From Meter Banditry to Genuine Terrorism." *Southeast Asian Affairs* (2006): 251.

The resources of the ASG have been vulnerable to interdiction. In 2004, the GRP formed an anti-terrorism task force and took several measures to disrupt the operations of the ASG. The task force established an anti-terrorism information system, improved intelligence sharing, pushed for the passage of an anti-terrorism law to improve prosecution of captured terrorists, passed an anti-money laundering act, worked with the US Department of the Treasury to seize the assets of key ASG leaders, and AFP raids seized significant amounts of ASG weapons and bomb-making materiel.[66] These actions decimated the organization, reducing the active membership from 1269 known members to less than 250.[67] This vulnerability existed despite the willingness of many local Muslims to provide shelter and resources to the ASG.

The differences between these two insurgencies warrant different approaches. MILF leadership pursued a pragmatic approach to achieving a political resolution. The grievances of the MILF were rooted in historic disfranchisement and actions taken against an ethnic and religious minority. The MILF did not pursue a transnational or purely ideological agenda, although leadership did find alliances of convenience with the ASG and other terrorist groups at times. The MILF remained local, strengthened local networks and fostered solidarity. The geography of the Philippines allowed the MILF to operate outside the effective jurisdiction of Manila, and the insular tendencies of the MILF prevented the development of external dependencies that could have been exploited by the GRP as a weakness. In contrast, the ASG maintained an expansive jihadist agenda that was irreconcilable with any political concessions. The group relied on Jemaah Islamiyah and a foreign Wahabbist ideology that only loosely connected adherents. Furthermore, the purely ideological jihadist objectives immediately earned the ire of the United States and other

[66] Ibid, 257.
[67] Ibid.

powers who facilitated the isolation and interdiction of assets. The MILF embraced an agenda that encouraged the United States to pressure the GRP to make concessions whereas the ASG embraced an agenda that encouraged its own destruction and political marginalization.

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION

I analyze two questions regarding the intervention. First, I ask what role the intervening force assumed. In this case, the GRP did not permit the intervening military forces to engage in direct combat, but did authorize US forces to train, advise, and assist. The AFP remained in the lead and this empowered ownership of the counterinsurgency strategy. Second, I ask what role neighboring states played in the intervention. In the case of the Philippines, the support of regional partners enabled a more effective reconciliation process and assisted in the containment of irreconcilable insurgents. The neighbors legitimized the peace process and expanded the negotiation space.

Intervention Overview

In the wake of the attacks of September 11, 2001, the United States increased efforts to combat Islamic terrorism around the globe. In the Philippines, the presence of the extremist elements previously discussed prompted intervention under the auspices of Operation Enduring Freedom – Philippines. The initial intervention consisted of approximately 1,300 US troops stationed in various locations throughout the southern Philippine islands. The intervention force was organized as Joint Task Force (JTF) 510. The task force consisted of an air component stationed at Cebu to provide close air, medical evacuation, and logistical support, JTF staff to plan and coordinate operations, approximately 300 Navy Construction Battalion personnel to conduct civil-military operations, and 160 Army Special Forces to train, advise, and mentor the Armed Forces of

the Philippines (AFP).[68] The operation was named Balikatan 02-1, and was centered along three primary lines of effort. First, American forces would build the capacity of the AFP through training and provision of key enabling assets. Second, US forces would enable Filipino led civil-military operations to enhance the legitimacy of the GRP. Finally, the US would provide support to Filipino led information operations to publicize the successes of the first two lines of operation. [69]

Role of US Forces

The role of American troops in the Philippines was decidedly a non-combat role. While soldiers were authorized to carry weapons, and maintain an inherent right to self-defense, the role was to advise, assist, and enable the GRP to conduct an indigenous counterinsurgency campaign. This is consistent with the doctrine of foreign internal defense and counterinsurgency theory that assumes indirect action to enable indigenous forces is more likely to lead to sustainable outcomes. In short, the smaller the footprint, the better.[70] JTF 510 worked along the lines of effort described previously to improve the combat readiness of the AFP, conduct civil-military operations, and communicate success along these lines of effort to enhance the legitimacy of the GRP and degrade the effectiveness of the ASG.

To build the capacity of the AFP, US troops first analyzed the state of readiness of both the AFP and the facilities occupied by the AFP. Due to a lack of resources and attention from the GRP, AFP soldiers in the southern Philippines were poorly equipped and lacked many of the basic skills necessary to wage a counterinsurgency campaign.[71]

---

[68] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF-Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review* 86, 6 (2006): 6.
[69] Ibid.
[70] Ibid, 4.
[71] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF-Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review* 86, 6 (2006): 7.

Counterinsurgency warfare requires culturally astute soldiers who are simultaneously masters of small unit tactics. This form of warfare requires exceptional discipline and maturity due to the fact that minor oversights at the tactical level may have strategic consequences. US troops trained AFP units on collective small unit tactics, improved the defensibility of AFP outposts, provided advanced medical training, and accompanied AFP units on combat patrols (as advisors) to instill confidence in their partners.[72] This training program increased the frequency and proficiency of AFP combat patrols and this established a GRP presence in previously denied areas. Consequently, the influence of the GRP was extended by the improved security situation and the increased visibility of the AFP. This was accomplished through the AFP without US troops assuming an administrative role. US troops focused on building partner capacity through training, observing, and enabling the success of the AFP.

In addition to training, US forces enabled AFP led civil-military operations. The US military deployed troops specially trained to conduct civil affairs operations based on the needs of the civilian populace. These operations initially consisted of humanitarian assistance, but were eventually tailored to the specific needs of the community. The Navy deployed Naval Construction specialists to conduct larger projects, such as digging wells, building roads, bridges, and piers.[73] These operations were conducted through the AFP with minimal US troop presence. These operations succeeded by allowing the AFP to interact with the population in insurgent controlled, or influenced, villages in a positive manner. This increased interaction countered the narrative of the ASG and consequently reduced ASG tacit support in the target villages and led to better relations between the

[72] Linda Robinson, "The SOF Experience in the Philippines and the Implications for Future Defense Strategy," Prism 6 (2016): 153-4.

[73] Gregory Wilson, "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF-Philippines and the Indirect Approach," *Military Review* 86, 6 (2006): 8.

Muslim population and the AFP. These operations ultimately improved security by demonstrating that the GRP possessed the will and capacity to improve the lives of Muslim Filipinos.[74]

Neighboring States

The immediate neighbors of the host nation were not directly involved in the intervention. Operation Enduring Freedom – Philippines is a distinctly bi-lateral operation that includes troops from the US and the Philippines. The support of neighboring states is essential to combat a transnational threat. Personnel, weapons, and other resources flow freely across porous borders to sustain the operations of terrorist organizations. In the case of the Philippines, the capacity of the GRP is sufficient to provide the troops and resources to conduct a counterinsurgency, and neighboring states were not called on to provide combat forces. However, Malaysia, Indonesia, and ASEAN all contributed in some way to the success of the GRP operation against the ASG.

First, Malaysia played a crucial role in the negotiations with the MILF. As stated previously in this paper, the GRP appealed to Malaysia to act as a diplomatic intermediary to initiate peace talks. This led to six rounds of peace talks that ultimately led to a negotiated settlement with the MILF.[75] While the intervention did not seek to resolve the conflict with the MILF, the previous negotiation of that conflict separated the ASG from a larger and more influential organization. Furthermore, the MILF could no longer provide active support for the ASG without compromising the hard won economic and political gains. Malaysian support for the MILF peace process indirectly assisted the GRP and the US in the fight against the ASG.

---

[74] Ibid.

[75] Al-Haj Murad Ebrahim et al., "Peace at Last in the Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro," 635.

Second, Indonesia is home to Jemaah Islamiyah, a group that is supportive of the ASG and has been known to provide bomb-making material and expertise to Filipino ASG operatives.[76] The Indonesian government has taken significant action to combat terrorism within its borders, passing an anti-terrorism law that was revised after the 2002 Bali bombings that led to the arrest of several members of Jemaah Islamiyah.[77] The Indonesian government was criticized heavily for the capture and subsequent light sentencing of the spiritual leader of Jemaah Islamiyah, Abu Bakar Bashir.[78] However, US and Australian counterterrorism and law enforcement experts, working with the Indonesian government, established a counter terrorism task force that has had impressive success in dismantling Jemaah Islamiyah in Indonesia. This group seized bomb making material and weapons, uncovered the organizational structure chart, and ultimately captured more than 400 terrorist suspects, to include JI leader Abu Dujana.[79]

Finally, in addition to the actions of Malaysia and Indonesia, ASEAN has issued at least two declarations dealing directly with terrorism. At a meeting in 2002, the member states discussed measures to combat arms smuggling and drug trafficking, as well as extradition, law enforcement, and intelligence sharing to increase cooperation in response to terrorism in the region.[80]

Taken together, these developments indicate a supportive regional alliance and neighbors with the capacity to prosecute competent national counterterror strategies. While there is no evidence of direct assistance with the intervention, the intelligence sharing and

---

[76] Pamela Fabe Amparo, "The Cost of Terrorism: Bombings by the Abu Sayyaf Group in the Philippines," *Philippine Sociological Review*, 61, 1 (2013): 229-250.
[77] Ralf Emmers, "Comprehensive Security and Resilience in Southeast Asia: ASEAN's Approach to Terrorism," *The Pacific Review*, 22, 2 (2009): 164.
[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid, 170.

common enemies in Jemaah Islamiyah and the Abu Sayyaf Group indicate an understanding of the shared challenges.

CONCLUSION

This case study analyzed the various factors of the regime, the insurgency, and the intervention to evaluate the suitability of small footprint strategy to combat the terrorist threat in the Philippines.

The factors of the regime included measures of capacity and legitimacy. Capacity was measured by the ability of the regime to deliver basic services and provide security. Analysis demonstrates that as the regime gained greater capacity, as indicated by greater provision of goods and reduction in poverty, the counterinsurgency strategies implemented aligned closer with a classical counterinsurgency model. Legitimacy is derived from a restrained executive, political inclusion, and credible belief that the institutions of the regime are controlled by the government and are consistent with broadly shared norms of justice. The actions of Ferdinand Marcos sowed deep seeds of mistrust between the GRP and the insurgency, and the restoration of legitimacy occurred incrementally over several administrations and ultimately resulted in a peace agreement with the MILF. It must be noted that the GRP was not initially credible in the eyes of the MILF, as indicated by the repeatedly rebuffed overtures by the GRP that were later met with violence on both sides. Third-party interveners, in this case Malaysia and the United States, legitimated the peace process in a manner that the GRP was incapable of doing on its own. This case demonstrates the centrality of legitimacy to resolving an insurgency.

The factors of the insurgency include the potential for a negotiated settlement and the likelihood of resource interdiction. In the case of the MILF, the separatist movement is an ethnically homogenous movement grounded in sincere grievances. The aims of the

MILF shifted as political opportunities presented themselves, revealing the underlying economic and political interests that drove a pragmatic policy on behalf of the MILF. The resources of the MILF were not vulnerable to interdiction. Rather, the geography of the southern Philippines allowed for the decentralization of personnel and equipment as well as presenting significant challenges to the GRP. In the case of the MILF, the invulnerability resulted in a near parity with the AFP that may have ultimately contributed to the opportunity for a negotiated settlement. Again, the ability of the MILF to make itself legitimate to its adherents ensured that the MILF could negotiate and enforce the results of those negotiations. Similar to the analysis of the regime, the shared norms of justice and adherents' submission to formal authority enabled the MILF to consolidate power in a way that made it credible on the battlefield and in diplomacy. In contrast to the assessment of the MILF, the ASG appears to have limited potential for a negotiated settlement and high potential for interdiction of assets. The ASG remains a radical jihadist organization with a stated goal of establishing an Islamic state in the Philippines. The ASG exercises only limited control over its personnel and has continued to embrace terrorism. GRP and US actions to interdict ASG assets have successfully reduced the number of adherents from nearly 1,269 to roughly 250.

Analysis of the intervention reveals that intervening forces operated strictly in an observer/trainer mode. The GRP imposed strict rules of engagement that ensured the prominence of the AFP and this was supported by US forces in adherence to the doctrine of foreign internal defense. US forces provided training and mentorship, assisted the AFP in organizing civil-military operations to build relationships with civilians affected by the insurgents' activities, and engaged in information operations to strengthen the support from locals. This approach capitalized on the regime's ongoing peace process and focused on increasing the capacity of the GRP and the AFP. This increased the range of options

available for prosecuting a counterinsurgency strategy and made the government forces more effective and transparent. Improved capabilities and the carefully restrained nature of the US involvement ensured that increased legitimacy was not undermined. The neighboring states supported the operations indirectly. Malaysia acted as an intermediary to help the GRP overcome barriers to the peace process by providing a venue perceived as legitimate by the MILF and the GRP. This was necessary due to a history of broken promises and a lack of shared expectations of GRP behavior. Indonesia also contributed to the containment of transnational terrorist elements in Southeast Asia. Indonesia passed sweeping anti-terrorism laws to crack down on Jemaah Islamiyah, a sponsor of ASG activities in the Philippines. ASEAN also provided a venue for regional cooperation to fight terrorism.

This operation was well suited for a small footprint approach. The GRP consistently advanced to become a more capable and legitimate government. The MILF proved to be a pragmatic opposition that was more concerned with addressing grievances than exacting revenge. The ASG is persistent in its jihadist agenda but highly vulnerable to resource interdiction. Finally, the intervention avoided mission creep and allowed the institutions of the GRP and the AFP to conduct counterinsurgency with American advice and provision of assets. This last point is critical to solidifying the increased perceptions of legitimacy and strengthening shared notions of justice.

Chapter 4: Operation Serval – Mali Case Study

The French intervention in Mali provides another model for small footprint operations. While the methods employed are starkly contrasted against the American led intervention in the Philippines, the centrality of legitimacy to secure a negotiated resolution is equally apparent.

In January of 2013, Francois Hollande described the French strategic objectives in Mali as an effort to, "stop terrorist aggression, secure a country in which there are many thousand French people, and permit Mali to recover its territorial integrity." To achieve this, the French emphasized bold maneuver and engaged in creative diplomacy to build consensus among allies and secure support throughout the region. French operations relentlessly targeted insurgents, incorporated regional troops to provide security, and conducted civil-military operations to build support for the Malian regime. The French model required a significant force commitment to establish security and roll back the gains of the insurgency, but has since decreased its commitment significantly.

The French intervention is significant for four major reasons. First, the Malian regime had endured an ill-timed coup perpetrated by a Malian army officer as well as a decisive military defeat at the hands of the Mouvement National Pour la Liberation de l'Azawad (MNLA). The regime, although still in power at the time of French intervention, had lost all credibility and was viewed by many as illegitimate. Second, the French military participated directly in ground combat. This contradicts many expectations of small footprint operations as focused on conducting operations by, with, and through the host nation. In the case of Mali, the utter lack of capacity and legitimacy required intervention to re-establish both. French operations consisted of conventional movements of mechanized columns as well as attack aviation, airborne operations, and precision strikes

by special operations forces. Third, the enemy forces were composed of a mix of transnational organizations and local ethnic separatists. The initial grievances were expressed by ethnic Tuaregs returning from Libya, but this movement was soon seized upon by Al Qaeda in the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM). AQIM significantly influenced the ambitions and actions of the insurgency. The disparity among these various insurgent groups vying for control exposed rifts that were exploited through diplomatic efforts of regional partners. The credibility and perceived legitimacy of Algeria allowed for negotiations that effectively parsed these interests. Finally, French regional engagement and diplomacy provides an opportunity to analyze the impact of multi-lateral institutions and agreements. The French received unanimous support from the UN, negotiated troop commitments from Mali's neighbors, and coordinated with the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to build a sustainable coalition.

Although this operation is still ongoing, there are several observations that must be noted before the French model can be applied elsewhere. The French model was highly contingent on a history of regional engagement. The French have maintained an archipelago of legacy bases throughout the former French colonies that act as lily pads for staging operations. This factor, combined with the diplomatic relationships the French have fostered in the region, allowed the French to build combat power rapidly and act decisively. The early success of this operation should not be assumed to be replicable elsewhere, but should be understood as a result of circumstances unique to French intervention in Africa. Most significantly, the French actions in Mali violate many assumptions made by advocates who disavow direct action as a form of small footprint operations. For this reason, the intervention warrants a thorough investigation.

BACKGROUND

The root cause of the conflict in Mali is the ethnic tension between the Tuaregs of northern Mali and the southern Malian government in Bamako. The Tuareg, similar to the Kurds in Iraq, are a nation without a state. When the colonial powers allowed their African colonies to declare independence, the borders drawn resulted in the Tuareg people being split between Algeria, Tunisia, Mauritania, Mali, Niger and Chad.[81] Since independence, the Tuareg people have fought the government of Mali for greater autonomy and to bring development and security to their ancestral homeland referred to as Azawad. The Tuareg rebellion in the 1990s resulted in concessions from the Malian government that granted greater autonomy. This agreement is known as the National Pact.[82] However, political infighting and renewed tribal tension caused the Tuareg community to fracture. This discord was ultimately resolved by leaders from Mali's various ethnic groups through an agreement known as the Bourem Pact, which regulated access to resources and provided an informal political process to address grievances.[83] As the Malian government worked to enhance democratization and to decentralize state processes, the Tuareg people obtained a greater degree of autonomy and many leaders were coopted into the Malian government. Despite this positive development, low level raiding and infighting continued to be common among the Tuareg. The weakness of the Malian regime left the Tuareg vulnerable to infiltration, and AQIM seized the opportunity to provide protection and basic services that the government was incapable of providing. This led to connecting the Tuareg fight for independence to a broader jihadist movement. The events of the Arab Spring brought the delicate regional anti-terrorism efforts to the breaking point, and the fall of Qaddafi led

[81] Kalifa Keita, "Conflict and Conflict Resolution in the Sahel: The Tuareg Insurgency in Mali" (US Army War College, 1998) 6-8.
[82] Jennifer C. Seely, "A Political Analysis of Decentralisation: Coopting the Tuareg Threat in Mali" *Journal of Modern African Studies* 39, 3 (2001): 507.
[83] Baz Lecocq and Georg Klute, "Tuareg Separatism in Mali" *International Journal* 68, 3 (2013): 507.

to an influx of well-armed Tuareg fighters into the ungoverned spaces of northern Mali.[84] The combination of renewed separatist Tuareg conflict and global jihadism soon overwhelmed the weak Malian regime.

Tuareg Rebellion: 1990-1991

In the 1980s, Tuareg leaders prepared for a rebellion against the Malian government. They established weapons and ammunition caches across northern Mali. Malian authorities learned of the preparations, and dispatched the secret service to confiscate the weapons and apprehend the offending Tuareg fighters. In June 1990, a lightly armed group of Tuareg attacked the town of Menaka to free the prisoners, retrieve the confiscated weapons, and pillage trucks and supplies from the Malian military. The operation was a staggering success, and the rebels freed their imprisoned comrades, retrieved the previously seized weapons, and stole a fleet of four-wheel drive trucks and machine guns from the Malian military. The rebels later used the captured vehicles to their advantage by mounting machine guns and operating as a light cavalry organization, able to move quickly across the desert with significant firepower and mass their forces rapidly on any objective. This unit consisted of around 200 battle hardened Tuaregs, and roughly 4,000 Malian soldiers were deployed to combat the rebels.[85]

The Malian military, frustrated with its inability to defeat the Tuareg rebels, took vengeance on Tuareg civilians. These actions strengthened the resolve of the Tuareg and increased the active and tacit support that was provided to the rebels. The rebel movement came to be known as the Popular Movement for the Liberation of Azawad (MPLA).[86] The effective campaign against the Malian army led to a cease fire agreement, brokered by the

[84] David Francis, "The Regional Impact of the Armed Conflict and French Intervention in Mali" Report by the Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Center (2013): 4-5.
[85] Baz Lecocq et al, "Tuareg Separatism in Mali," *International Journal* 68, 3 (2013): 426.
[86] Ibid.

Algerians with President Traore, that granted autonomy to the Tuareg movement.[87] The history of Algerian intercession to mediate disputes between the Tuareg and the government in Bamako is similar to Malaysia mediating disputes between the GRP and the MILF. In these negotiations, we see the significance of Algeria in resolving disputes among the Tuareg and building the trust that will be necessary for resolving future disputes. Algeria is viewed as legitimate by both parties.

Shortly after granting Tuareg autonomy, President Traore was deposed and a new democratic regime was installed under the leadership of Alpha Oumar Konare. Konare's regime brokered another agreement in April 1992 with the French and Mauritanians mediating. This new peace agreement was known as the National Pact, and it called for the reintegration of rebel forces into the Malian army as well as programs for economic development in the heavily Tuareg north.[88] Both tasks proved highly problematic. Plans for economic development were stillborn, and reintegration largely resulted in Tuareg fighters deserting their Malian units and returning home. The inability of the government to deliver on the terms of the negotiated settlements undermined the legitimacy of the regime in the eyes of the Tuareg, and sowed the seeds for future conflict.

Tuareg Infighting: 1991-1996

After the victory over the Malian army in 1991, the complicated tribal and familial conflicts within the Tuareg coalition began to surface. The competing visions for the future of the Tuareg autonomous region resulted in the creation of several new organizations. These factions included the Popular Liberation Front of Azawad (FPLA) and the Revolutionary Liberation Army of Azawad (ARLA). In addition to these Tuareg groups,

---

[87] Ibid.

[88] Jennifer C. Seely, "A Political Analysis of Decentralisation: Coopting the Tuareg Threat in Mali" *Journal of Modern African Studies* 39, 3 (2001): 507.

Malian Arab tribes founded the Arab-Islamic Front of Azawad (FIAA).[89] This fragmentation reduced the strength of the MPLA which was then reorganized as the Popular Movement of Azawad (MPA). In the infighting, the MPA fought against the ARLA and the FPLA. The MPA later allied itself with the Malian army to defeat the ARLA and establish the MPA as the primary Tuareg power.[90] The regional instability also led to an increase in criminal activity, with many unemployed Tuaregs robbing commercial vehicles and travelers, as well as raiding villages near the Niger river, the unofficial border with southern Mali. These attacks on southern Malian villages prompted retaliation from the Songhay (a southern Malian ethnic group) who formed the Ganda Koy movement to defend their lands. This movement sought revenge against ethnic Tuaregs by attacking their villages and this resulted in the displacement of nearly 100,000 ethnic Tuaregs.[91] The Tuareg and Arab tribes of Azawad initiated reconciliation among the various fragmented groups in what came to be known as the Bourem Pact.[92] This movement was initiated by tribal elders and did not seek the counsel or approval of the various rebel factions or any state. Nonetheless, the Bourem Pact regulated access to resources, established "rencontres intracommunataires" to facilitate dialogue among various ethnic groups, and facilitated a return to peace. On 25 March 1996, a ceremony was held in Timbuktu that led to nearly a decade of peace.[93]

"Demokalashi" 1996-2006

The 1992 National Pact with the Malian government and the Bourem Pact ushered in a new period of Tuareg politics. Under the leadership of president Konare, the Bamako

[89] Baz Lecocq et al, "Tuareg Separatism in Mali," *International Journal* 68, 3 (2013): 426.
[90] Ibid, 427.
[91] Ibid.
[92] Baz Lecocq and Georg Klute, "Tuareg Separatism in Mali" *International Journal* 68, 3 (2013): 427.
[93] Ibid, 428.

government pursued policies of democratization and decentralization that allocated power over health, education, and infrastructure to local communes. As a result of decentralization policies, 682 communes established elected councils and mayors.[94] These programs provided much more opportunity for the Tuareg tribes to participate in the political process and order their affairs according to their traditions. This period was characterized by cooptation of Tuareg elites into the Malian government as well as continued political infighting that would result in political violence among the various Tuareg factions. Violence among the Tuareg was normally a result of conflicts over pastures, access to water, and occasional raiding.[95] Simultaneous to these political developments, the geostrategic value of the region changed. Western oil companies in search of hydrocarbons as well as increased commerce revived trans-Saharan trade routes and spawned development.[96] In addition to increased economic activity and development, the War on Terror brought new attention to the Sahel, initiating the American led Pan-Sahel Initiative establishing small tactical infrastructure at Tamanrasset (Algeria), Tessalit (Mali), and Assamaka (Niger).[97]

Internationalization of the Tuareg Conflict (Confronting AQIM in the Sahel)

The Groupe Salafiste de Predication et du Djihad (GSPC) was an Algerian Islamist nationalist movement later incorporated into Al Qaeda's global jihadist ideology. The GSPC sought to overthrow the Algerian regime and instite sharia law in Algeria.[98] In 2007, the GSPC was contacted by Yemeni and Saudi emissaries sent by Osama Bin Laden. The

---

[94] Jennifer C. Seely, "A Political Analysis of Decentralisation: Coopting the Tuareg Threat in Mali" *Journal of Modern African Studies* 39, 3 (2001): 499-501.
[95] Baz Lecocq and Georg Klute, "Tuareg Separatism in Mali" *International Journal* 68, 3 (2013): 428.
[96] Jedrzej George Frynas and Manuel Paulo, "A New Scramble for African Oil? Historical, Political, and Business Perspectives" African Affairs 106, 423 (2007): 237.
[97] Stephen Ellis, "The Pan-Sahel Initiative" *African Affairs* 103, 412 (2004): 462.
[98] Djallil Lounas, "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian Crisis," *Journal of North African Studies* 19, 5 (2014): 812.

emissaries proposed that the GSPC lead a regional jihadist organization throughout the Sahel. Bin Laden's vision was to unite Moroccan, Libyan, Mauritanian, Malian, and Algerian Islamist organizations under one banner to fight for the cause of global jihad. In 2007, Al Zawahiri formally announced the acceptance of the GSPC under the assumption that the organization would unite these various factions in North Africa. The new organization took up the banner of Al Qaeda and renamed itself Al Qaeda in the land of the Islamic Maghreb (AQIM).[99] AQIM had an estimated strength of around 1,500 fighters, and these forces were divided into two primary regions: Kabylia in Algeria and Azawad in northern Mali.[100]

AQIM forces in Kabylia numbered between 600 and 900 fighters. These fighters were focused on recruiting, kidnapping operations, and fighting the Algerian regime. Kabylia is also home to several other armed groups, many of which are opposed to radical Islamic ideology and would prefer to see AQIM eradicated. This has led to a general rejection from the people and has left AQIM largely isolated and surrounded. The terrain is mountainous and heavily wooded, which provides adequate cover and concealment from Algerian military forces. Nonetheless, the persistent fighting and restricted mobility due to the inhospitable local population has allowed the Algerian regime to effectively contain the Kabylia faction of AQIM.[101]

AQIM forces in the Sahel began with approximately 40 men led by Mokhtar Belmokhtar. This element was originally intended to provide a rear area threat to the Algerian regime, but later morphed into a broader movement consisting of around 500 fighters. The Salafist Algerians of AQIM found themselves surrounded by Tuaregs who

[99] Ibid, 813.
[100] Ibid.
[101] Ibid, 814.

practiced Sufi Islam, which the Salafists considered to be an apostate form of Islam. Despite the religious differences, the endemic poverty and weakness of the Malian military allowed AQIM to build rapport among the Tuaregs by providing basic services, food, and protection.[102] The lawless environment also allowed AQIM to raise additional funds through drug trafficking, smuggling, and kidnap for ransom operations which funded social welfare programs as well as weapons and ammunition for the Kabyle faction.[103]

AQIM's strategy in the Sahel allowed the movement to incorporate other regional actors. The Movement for Unicity and Jihad in West Africa (MUJAO) emerged as a Tuareg dominated faction that shared the global jihadist agenda with AQIM. To appeal to the Tuareg, AQIM appointed Abdel Krim Al Targui, the cousin of Iyad Ag Ghali, a prominent Tuareg leader, to lead the MUJAO. In addition to MUJAO, Iyad Ag Ghali formed the Ansar Al-Din movement as an ethnic Tuareg movement that was also aligned with AQIM and MUJAO. Ghali is central to the jihadist movement in Mali, as he was appointed by President Amadou Toumani Toure as the Malian Consul to Saudi Arabia, where he was radicalized and converted to Salafism.[104] Ghali's movement, Ansar al-Din, would later provide a Salafist alternative to the more secular Tuareg dominated MNLA.

Algeria perceived the threat of AQIM as an existential threat to Algerian sovereignty. Consequently, the Algerian army pursued a strategy of containment of the Kabyle faction and a cooperative regional approach to interdict resources and communication traveling north from the Sahel. The Algerian Army successfully interdicted AQIM personnel and weapons attempting to enter Algeria from ungoverned spaces in Mali. Between 2007 and 2010 more than 1,200 AQIM jihadis were arrested and 250 killed

[102] Ibid, 815.
[103] Ibid.
[104] Ibid, 816.

attempting to cross north into Algeria.[105] Tunisia and Libya were close partners with Algeria in a policy designed to contain AQIM in the ungoverned spaces of the Sahel and deny access to their respective countries. These safe havens remained due to Algeria's constitutional limitations on the exercise of military power that prohibited the Algerian army from operating in a foreign country without an existing treaty authorizing an intervention.[106] Despite the constitutional limitations, the Algerians developed intelligence sharing and cooperative anti-terrorism measures that were effective. For example, these efforts resulted in the capture of Abderrazak Al-Para, the former second in command of the GSPC, in Libya at the hands of Chadian forces. He was subsequently extradited to Algeria.[107] Mauritania was also engaged in anti-terrorism activities, supported heavily by the French. Mali was much less successful. Despite US training, the Malian forces were no match for AQIM and the organization continued to operate with near impunity in the northern areas of Mali.[108] There is suspicion that the Malian president had a secret agreement with AQIM that resolved to allow them to operate in the north so long as there was no interference in the south. This is consistent with accounts that the Malian president was not interested in the plight of northern Malians, particularly the Tuaregs.[109]

Algerian efforts to contain AQIM required cooperation with Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia, and Libya. The initial results were promising, as Al Qaeda was effectively contained in the ungoverned spaces of the Sahel. The Algerians were hesitant to share the role of regional power broker with the US or France. The Algerians were intent

---

[105] Ibid, 820.
[106] Ibid.
[107] Baz Lecocq and Paul Schrijver, "The War on Terror in a Haze of Dust: Potholes and Pitfalls on the Saharan Front" *Journal of Contemporary African Studies*, 25 (2007): 145.
[108] Hussein Solomon, "The African State and the Failure of US Counter-terrorism Initiatives in Africa: The Cases of Niger and Mali" South African Journal of International Affairs, 20 (2013): 427.
[109] Djallil Lounas, "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian Crisis," *Journal of North African Studies* 19, 5 (2014): 820.

on maintaining control and pursuing a regional diplomatic approach. They mistrusted the intentions of the French as the French engaged in diplomatic and security agreements with several other north African states. This equilibrium that was arduously obtained and delicately managed by Algeria, was upset dramatically by the events of the Arab Spring. The aftermath of the Arab Spring led to the utter collapse of the Algerian strategy of containment. Most significantly, the collapse of the Qaddafi regime benefited AQIM directly. The breakdown of containment caused by the overthrow in Libya led to the return of Tuareg fighters to Mali.[110]

The Aftermath of Qaddafi's Defeat, January 2012 – January 2013

In January of 2012 nomadic Tuareg tribesmen returned to northern Mali after years of fighting for Muammar Qaddafi in Libya. These fighters returned with weapons and equipment pilfered from Qaddafi's stores and they made quick work of the poorly trained and poorly equipped Malian forces. These fighters, approximately 1,000 in number, re-ignited the rebellion of the 1960s and 1990s. The fighters formed the Mouvement National Pour la Liberation de l'Azawad (MNLA) and declared their purpose to liberate Azawad (Mali north of the Niger river).[111] The Malian army, particularly junior officers, resented the poor performance of the government and blamed the president for the humiliating defeat.[112]

On March 22, 2012 Captain Amadou Sanogo, a Malian army officer, led a coup to remove President Amadou Toumani Toure. Sanogo cited the lack of weapons and equipment for the Malian army and he believed that the President had fundamentally failed

---

[110] Ibid, 821-2.
[111] Adam Nossiter, "Qaddafi's Weapons, Taken by Old Alllies, Reinvigorate an Insurgent Army in Mali," *New York Times,* February 5, 2012.
[112] Adam Nossiter, "Soldier's Overthrow Mali Government in Setback for Democracy in Africa," *New York Times*, March 22, 2012.

to protect the territorial integrity of Mali.[113] The coup came as a surprise because Mali was considered an African success story of developing democracy due to the pursuit of democratization and decentralization previously noted.[114] The international community condemned the coup and Sanogo promised a return to civilian rule contingent upon elections. Toure, the president overthrown by Sanogo, was scheduled to leave office in one month and had agreed not to stand for another term.[115] The coup was an ill-timed expression of discontent that resulted in weakening Mali further. The coup was a reaction to the failure of Toure, but the result of the coup was an emboldened rebellion that was now poised to make further territorial gains at the expense of the Malian government.[116]

On April 6, 2012, the MNLA declared the liberation of the independent state of Azawad. The rebels seized Timbuktu, a city of great cultural and historic significance to Malians, immediately prior to the announcement of liberation. The MNLA took advantage of the opportunity presented by the coup in the south. The political infighting prevented the Malian government from negotiating a political resolution. French and US officials feared that the deteriorating situation in northern Mali would embolden AQIM to exploit the ungoverned space and expand operations throughout north Africa.[117] The international community was also hesitant to involve itself with the military junta now in control of Mali, but there was still no recognition or legitimacy granted to the claims of an independent Azawad. These two conflicting concerns are expressed by the fact that ECOWAS imposed economic sanctions to express disapproval with the coup leaders, but simultaneously

[113] Ibid.
[114] Ibid.
[115] Lydia Polgreen and Alan Cowell, "Mali Rebels Proclaim Independent State in North," *New York Times*, April 6, 2012.
[116] Ibid.
[117] Ibid.

contemplated plans to commit troops to assist Mali.[118] The conditions were ripe for terrorist infiltration of the movement as much of the country was now ungovernable and involvement posed a great enough political risk to keep the international community at a distance.

The fears of the international community were confirmed in June of 2012 as hard line Islamists flooded into Mali and imposed a harsh interpretation of Islamic Law.[119] The rebel movement was now under the control of Ansar Din and Sharia law was imposed in all controlled territories. Music was forbidden, thieves suffered amputation, and Malians were subject to public floggings and executions.[120] Islamists established morality police to enforce Sharia law and it was applied enthusiastically. Timbuktu's cultural treasures were defaced, particularly a shrine to a 15th century saint. The human rights abuses were profound, with reports of repeated rape of Malian women and abuse of children.[121] The conditions established by the Islamists drove many Malians from their homes in fear.

Over 92,000 Malian refugees fled Islamic rule to refugee camps in nearby Mauritania.[122] Refugees described the circumstances in Mali and confirmed the influx of terrorists from abroad, indicating the broad attraction of an ungovernable region to international terrorist organizations. Furthermore, this influx of foreign fighters under the banner of AQIM caused a conflict with the largely Tuareg MNLA, indicating a rift in the Islamist coalition.[123] Those who remained in Mali were subject to the cruelties of foreign

---

[118] Ibid.
[119] Adam Nossiter, "In Timbuktu, Harsh Change Under Islamists," *The New York Times*, June 2, 2012.
[120] Ibid.
[121] Ibid.
[122] Adam Nossiter, "Jihadists' Fierce Justice Drives Thousands to Flee Mali," *The New York Times*, July 17, 2012.
[123] Ibid.

hardline Islamists. With the marginalization of the MNLA there was a fracturing of the coalition that led some who remained behind in Mali to take up arms.[124]

The international community had not yet determined a plan to assist Mali with military forces, though there was discussion of West African nations supplying 3,000 troops to assist with security. This modest military assistance was not approved by the United Nations Security Council and there was no plan to fund it.[125] Under these conditions, many Malians flocked to the militias. The army was still in disarray, but army leaders provided training to volunteers nonetheless. These individuals were poorly equipped; many were not supplied with weapons and there was no ammunition for training.[126] Nonetheless, these volunteers lived with the reality that their relatives were suffering under the rule of Islamists in northern Mali and felt they had nowhere else to turn. Despite the willingness of the militiamen to fight, the army suffered from a crisis of confidence and the absence of any movement to assist from the international community.[127] The UN sent humanitarian aid for occupied areas, but without a military commitment from a capable partner, or a consensus for action from the international community, there was little cause for optimism.[128]

The United Nations Security Council, with strong French encouragement, resolved to consider acting in Mali. On October 12, 2012, after months of hesitation and failing to commit, the UN Security Council asked for a detailed plan for intervention to be submitted within 45 days.[129] The international community decided that the crisis caused by the large

---

[124] Ibid.
[125] Adam Nossiter, "Saying Mali 'Is Our Country,' Militias Train to Oust Islamists," *The New York Times*, August 5, 2012.
[126] Ibid.
[127] Ibid.
[128] Ibid.
[129] Adam Nossiter, "The Whiff of Conflict Grows in Mali," *The New York Times*, October 23, 2012.

influx of foreign fighters, and the humanitarian crisis causing more than 300,000 refugees, posed a significant threat to stability in north Africa.[130] Furthermore, AQIM and its affiliates established training camps to expand their ranks and improve their combat readiness. There were even reports of young children engaging in military training.[131] The French were the most vocal proponents of military action to restore order to northern Mali. Many French citizens live abroad in North Africa, and there was a palpable fear of an escalation of kidnappings and other terrorist attacks as the Jihadists grew in strength and influence.[132] This initial discussion proposed Algerian, Chadian, or Mauritanian troops as the ground forces, with European and American forces providing airlift, intelligence support, or other enablers.[133] The international mood began to shift in favor of intervention, and the Islamists were compelled to respond.

As western nations moved towards acceptance of armed intervention, AQIM and its affiliates in northern Mali responded with a sharp increase in kidnappings.[134] Kidnapping was a lucrative industry for Jihadists. AQIM is reported to have collected over $90 million in ransom from western powers.[135] The ransoms collected were used to arm and equip the Jihadists and this in turn fueled more kidnappings. These terrorist groups also believed that holding Europeans captive was insurance against intervention, claiming that if airstrikes began they would "have their throats cut like chickens, one after the other."[136] This created a policy conundrum for western governments. The United States is unique in that it does not negotiate or pay ransom. America's European allies on the other

130 Ibid.
131 Ibid.
132 Ibid.
133 Ibid.
134 Adam Nossiter, "Millions in Ransoms Fuel Militants' Clout in West Africa," *The New York Times*, December 12, 2012.
135 Ibid.
136 Ibid.

hand were largely responsible for funding the kidnapping operations that were so effectively used as political leverage against them. As this situation escalated, the international community was compelled to respond more forcefully.

On December 20, 2012, the UN Security Council unanimously approved sending thousands of troops to Mali.[137] These troops were to be sourced by Mali's African neighbors, mainly Chad, Mauritania, and Burkina Faso. However, the ground troops were not to be committed until Mali made considerable progress with its own military.[138] It was projected that these forces would not commence operations against the Islamists in northern Mali until September or October of 2013.[139] This would have left the country languishing under Islamic rule for the better part of a year. The international community was hesitant to pour resources and troops into Mali while the political instability and infighting continued. The international community also insisted that Mali provide a framework for a return to elected civilian rule.[140] The United Nations Security Council suggested that it was a primary goal to find a political resolution that did not involve military action.[141] A lack of confidence in the Malian army on behalf of the French and Americans indicated that there were significant doubts about the Malians' ability to perform adequately in a long fight against the Islamist forces in the north.

The military situation remained relatively static until January 10, 2013 when Islamist forces attacked south to seize the village of Konna from Malian government forces.[142] The Malian army was thoroughly defeated and fled Konna in disarray. Konna

---

[137] Rick Gladstone, "U.N. Council Votes to Help Mali's Army Oust Islamists," *The New York Times*, December 20, 2012.
[138] Ibid.
[139] Ibid.
[140] Ibid.
[141] Ibid.
[142] Adam Nossiter, "Mali Government Is Left Reeling After Islamists Take Village Long Held by Army," *The New York Times*, January 10, 2013.

had strategic value to the Malians and the loss of Konna now left a critical airfield in Sevare vulnerable to attack.[143] The international community watched in shock as the Malian army crumbled once again. There was hope that the army would have improved following its abysmal performance earlier in the year. In fact, the international community, before the fall of Konna, still believed that a resolution involving Malian forces re-taking northern Mali was preferable.[144] Hope of an improved situation in Mali collapsed as Konna fell, prompting an emergency meeting of the UN Security Council and a letter from Mali's interim president Dioncounda to French Ambassador to the UN Gerard Araud requesting assistance.[145] It was abundantly clear that Mali could no longer contain, or even limit, the actions of the Islamist forces in the north. Islamist forces were now within striking distance of Mali's major population center, Bamako, and the window of opportunity for action was beginning to close.[146]

On January 11th, President of France, Francois Hollande, announced three distinct objectives of the intervention, to "stop the terrorist aggression, secure a country in which there are many thousand French people, and permit Mali to recover its territorial integrity."[147] The strategy initially called for simply blocking the movements of insurgents south of the Niger river and then waiting for the construction of an international coalition before commencing offensive operations to roll back the previous gains of the Islamists. The French military received intelligence regarding the disposition and expectations of the insurgent forces. The terrorist elements did not expect French forces to pursue them, and these enemy forces may have resolved to simply offer passive resistance to deny a superior

[143] Ibid.
[144] Ibid.
[145] Ibid.
[146] Adam Nossiter and Eric Schmitt, "France Battling Islamist in Mali," *New York Times*, Jan. 11, 2013.
[147] Michael Shurkin, "*France's War in Mali: Lessons for an Expeditionary Army*." RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA (2014): 8.

force an opportunity for a decisive engagement. Insurgent forces could simply abandon the gains made and scatter into the mountains or into the villages, as the FLN did in Algeria following the Battle of Algiers.

Observing that the opportunity for a decisive confrontation was dissipating, the French abandoned their previous strategy and built a revised strategy on two basic premises. First, that French forces would have to move fast and outpace the insurgents. Francois Hollande stated this clearly in his guidance, saying "destroy those in front of you and go fast."[148] Second, ground operations are central. This second point is articulated well by a prominent French military theorist, Vincent Desportes:

> Contact on the ground, over the longer term, affirms itself as an essential argument, and combat, always combined arms at the lowest level, at short distances and even close quarters, comes back in force. On the contrary, the pertinence of standoff – combat at safe distance – declines. The dream of "fire and forget" dissolves before the absolute necessity of occupying newly secured space, meter by meter.[149]

These two characteristics would come to define Operation Serval. Combining speed with ground operations allowed the French to dictate operational tempo by maintaining constant pressure on the insurgent forces.

ANALYSIS OF GOVERNMENT

The understanding that small footprint operations are more likely to succeed if the regime is reasonably capable and perceived as legitimate must be elaborated for the Malian context. Whereas the Filipino government was reasonably capable and required only an augmentation of capabilities and diplomatic intervention to pursue a peace process, the Malian case is one of abject failure of both capacity and legitimacy. I generally presume that significant state failure, such as the case in Mali, is ill suited to a small footprint

[148] Ibid.
[149] Ibid.

intervention. Mali, as a tactical success story, seems to contradict this understanding. Despite a lack of both capacity and legitimacy, French forces intervened with a small footprint strategy and achieved a stunning tactical success. I now turn to an evaluation of regime capacity and legitimacy.

Capacity

Per capita electric power consumption in Mali is reported as 34.6 kilowatt hours per person.[150] This data was not available through the World Bank's data, which reflects the extraordinarily low consumption. This figure is a 2010 estimate and reflects the inability of the government to provide this service at the time the insurgency took hold. The percentage of the population with access to improved water and sanitation is extremely low. In 2012, only 23.3% of Malians had access to improved sanitation facilities while only 70.9% had access to clean water.[151] Furthermore, during the period in question the national economy contracted by 3.3% and Mali was ranked 182 of 187 countries on the World Development Index.[152] These conditions combine to create a sense of constant chaos and famine in Mali. Poverty is endemic, with 47% of Malians living below the global poverty line, and thousands suffering from infectious diseases due to poor sanitation. Taken together, these indicators reveal a government that was incapable of providing basic services or improving the lives of citizens. Despite the constitutional reforms of 1992 and the efforts of democratization and decentralization, the Malian government was unable to make itself credible. In this sense, legitimacy was directly tied to state capacity. The government, on paper at least, sought to grant a significant degree of autonomy but lacked

[150] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2016).
[151] WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply and Sanitation (http://www.wssinfo.org)
[152] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa* (New York, Cambridge University Press, 2016)

the capacity to enforce the rule of law or exert effective leadership.[153] This lack of capacity, especially in northern Mali, provided an opportunity for AQIM to build support for its jihadist agenda by providing some basic elements of governance at very low cost.

The military also suffered from a lack of capacity. As noted previously, the military had proven ineffective at combating lightly armed rebels. The entire military apparatus, to include police and reserve forces, numbered 10,720 personnel.[154] The inability of the army to provide security is frequently reported, and the widespread insecurity led many to join militias, gangs, criminal organizations, or the jihadists to achieve a greater sense of security. Furthermore, the poor reputation of the Malian defense forces has led many to suspect that the humanitarian failures and barbarity of the Malian army is equivalent to the crimes committed by the Islamist factions.[155] Not only do the Malian people have no faith in the ability of the Malian army to protect them from external threats, they actively fear the intentions of their defense forces. Legitimacy requires that the use of force be subject to cultural norms of authority. In this context, where force is exerted by factions warring against one another, the government's illegitimacy is nakedly apparent.

The lack of Malian state and military capacity may have been further undermined by international aid. Stephanie Pezard and Michael Shurkin, argue that a surge in international aid has become a contested resource among the various Tuareg groups.[156] It is possible that the lack of Malian capacity illustrated through a decentralized government lacking authority and accountability fostered an environment of patronage politics. It is not unreasonable to suggest that in this type of environment, international aid organizations

---

[153] Francesco Saraceno, "Reflections on Azawad Crisis and Malian Statehood, its Deficiencies and Inclusion Failure," *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 50, 3 (2015): 344
[154] Ibid, 351.
[155] Stephanie Pezard et al., "Achieving Peace in Northern Mali," RAND Corporation (2015): 39.
[156] Ibid, 28.

unintentionally removed the government as an honest broker and service provider by injecting additional resources to be distributed through patronage.

Legitimacy

The most obvious condemnation of the legitimacy of the Malian government is that the government experienced a coup d'etat during a time of existential crisis. The ousted president was not up for re-election, and his term was set to expire in four weeks. This fact makes the coup seem nonsensical. Yet two facts illuminate the logic behind the coup. First, the president, Amadou Toumani Toure, ordered a constitutional referendum within weeks of the end of his term. The timing of this action led many to believe that he was intent on amending the constitution to maintain power.[157] While Mali did have a reputation for stable democracy, it should be remembered that democratic institutions were barely 20 years old at the time and the military coup that ushered in the democratic reforms in 1991 was still living memory for many Malians. Second, despite the failures of the Malian army, the army still enjoyed higher trust among the people than the president. Susanna Wing reports that 42% of Malians trust the National Assembly, 43% trust the President, and 67% trust the military.[158] The short lived democratic tradition, threat of constitutional referendum resulting in a seizure of power, acceptance of military coups as legitimate options for regime change, and the higher trust in the army than the president are all aspects of the domestic political situation that better inform our judgment. It bodes poorly for Mali that the military was viewed as more legitimate than the government, as the military crumbled in the face of a growing insurgency.

To examine legitimacy further, I turn to the question of political inclusion. The 1992 National Pact provided an opportunity for ethnic Tuaregs to participate in the political

[157] Susanna Wing, "Briefing: Mali Politics of a Crisis," *African Affairs* 112 (2013): 478.
[158] Ibid. 479

system. The government of Mali made a concerted effort to co-opt Tuareg leaders and to allow for greater autonomy. Despite these efforts, evidence of inclusion is scant. First, many Tuaregs express that the vision of nationhood espoused by the government in Bamako deliberately excludes the narrative of their people. This is significant because political inclusion requires political reality as a prerequisite.[159] Inclusion requires a national identity of some sort, and the deliberate attempt to exclude the Tuareg undermined all future concessions or negotiations for greater autonomy.[160] Second, the attempts at greater inclusion involved an expansion of government roles. The Malian government sought more government rather than better government.[161] This led to an overly collaborative form of governance that effectively weakened the power of government officials. In the north where the government had very little capacity, this resulted in a government that lacked credibility. This was further exacerbated by an immature democratic system wherein many of the actors still perceived politics as a zero-sum game and failed to grasp the value of democratic competition. Instead, Malian elites favored consensus politics and patronage.[162] Finally, political inclusion can be measured by voting data. In the two most populous regions of northern Mali, Gao and Kidal, voter turnout in the presidential elections in 2005 was 16.29% and 16.53% respectively. This contrasts with the most populous southern Malian regions of Kayes, Koulikoro, and Mopti that had turnout of 45.55%, 56.4%, and 41.5% respectively.[163] This disparity in the exercise of the right to vote between the north and south demonstrates a lack of interest on the part of the northern Malians, which is likely a result of political exclusion. Furthermore, the necessity of shared notions of justice is not

[159] Stephanie Pezard et al., "Achieving Peace in Northern Mali," 34.
[160] Ibid.
[161] Ibid, 30.
[162] Ibid, 31.
[163] Francesco Saraceno, "Reflections on Azawad Crisis and Malian Statehood, its Deficiencies and Inclusion Failure," 346.

achieved in a system where various ethnic groups ascribe to their own understanding of justice and governance.

Executive authority of the president was perceptibly weak. The presidency under ATT was suspected of corruption and even complicity in the kidnapping and violence of AQIM. There is evidence of complicity between government officials and terrorist organizations operating throughout the north. The drug trade and other illicit activities have strengthened this partnership and democracy has been the primary casualty. This invited AQIM and other groups to operate in the north and allowed them to gain legitimacy as the people perceived the government as weak and ineffective.[164] These perceptions of corruption and complicity had disastrous effects on the military, as three out of four Malian military units operating in the north defected when the insurgency began. Defection of Malian military personnel swelled the ranks of the MNLA by 1,600 armed soldiers.[165] Considering the relative weakness of the military, this is not a negligible defection and this further indicates that those responsible for employing the instruments of state power had different notions of the just application of force. The unwillingness to fight for the government indicates that even the military did not share the government's formal articulation of norms of justice. In this case, notions of justice were certainly not broadly shared, but were as fractious as the Malian ethnic identity.

Mali lacked both capacity and legitimacy. The government was unable to provide basic services, and the military was incapable of providing security in the north. What little capacity the state possessed was frittered away through consensus politics and potentially undermined by international aid that injected more resources into a system of patronage with ineffective oversight. The state lacked legitimacy and there is demonstrable exclusion

[164] Susanna Wing, "Briefing: Mali Politics of a Crisis," 481.
[165] Ibid.

of northern Malians. The weakness of the president and the Malian institutions proved that the government could not be trusted to enforce the rule of law. This is apparent by the partnership between the government and the Islamist forces in the north. The Malian government pursued the common solution to ethnic conflicts in Africa, decentralization and delegation of governmental authority to appease separatists. This opened the door for transnational organizations to take advantage of an ungovernable space. The lack of capacity precluded any real sharing of power through this approach and the resulting elections became nothing more than an ethnic census.[166] Mali, despite the laudable democratic achievements, was nothing more than a thin veneer of democracy at the time of the French intervention.

ANALYSIS OF THE INSURGENCY

The French intervention in Mali is concerned with two types of insurgencies: transnational jihadists and local separatist insurgent groups. At times these groups coalesce due to common interests, but these groups maintain different aspirations and the coalitions formed around common grievances can be fractured through strategic diplomatic engagement that appeals to the core interests of the reconcilable groups and isolates the irreconcilables. AQIM, Ansar al-Din, and MUJAO viewed an independent Azawad as central to a regional Islamist movement and espoused an ideological jihadist agenda that appealed to many Muslims beyond nationality and political boundaries. On the other hand, the MNLA remained primarily concerned with Tuareg independence and proved more pragmatic through cooperation with the French forces.

---

[166] Jean Ping, "The Crisis in Mali: Outlining a Course to Peace and Stability," *Harvard International Review* 34, 3 (2014): 23.

Tuareg Separatist Insurgent Groups

The Tuareg path to a negotiated settlement is evident for two reasons. First, the Tuareg separatist groups have a history of using both diplomacy and violence to advance political goals. The Tuareg rebelled in 1991 to seek greater representation and political inclusion and used violence to bring the regime in Bamako to the table. The military prowess of a small group of lightly armed Tuareg handled the Malian army rather roughly, and forced a negotiated settlement in the National Pact of 1992. Failure of the Bamako regime to live up to the terms resulted in continued violence until a more lasting peace was brokered in 2006. In both circumstances the Tuareg used calculated violence to provoke a political settlement. The actions of the Tuareg in rebellion are rooted in legitimate concerns that can be resolved through negotiation. Second, the MNLA was rejected by the extremists and collaborated extensively with the French. The MNLA led a loose coalition that included AQIM, Ansar al-Din and MUJAO to rapid victories in Timbuktu, Gao, and Kidal.[167] The Malian army was defeated, and the more extreme groups allied with AQIM no longer tolerated the secular nature of the MNLA. The MNLA stood by as sharia law was imposed and control of the operation was ceded to AQIM. Many within the MNLA resented the jihadists marginalization of their movement, and when the French intervened, the MNLA were willing to offer tacit support.[168] This fractured the coalition, isolated the more extreme elements, and presented an opportunity for the intervention force to ally itself with the MNLA to compete with AQIM for Tuareg support.

The resources of separatist groups are not easily interdicted. Familial and tribal ties provide tacit and active support for separatist activities. Financial support, equipment, and basic provision can be more easily acquired when the insurgency is supported by the

[167] Susanna Wing, "Briefing: Mali Politics of a Crisis," 482.
[168] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa,* 147.

people. The resources of a decentralized insurgency are much more difficult to interdict because there is very little movement or consolidation. When weapons or ammunition are consolidated, the tacit support of the people makes it much more difficult for the government to locate the caches. Furthermore, the current livelihood patterns may often continue to make provision for fighters. Transnational groups will turn to smuggling and kidnapping, as was the case with AQIM, and these activities draw the attention of foreign governments who will pressure the indigenous government to crack down on such behavior. An insurgency that enjoys tacit support inside its ancestral homeland will reveal no such pattern for exploitation.

Transnational Insurgent Groups

AQIM in the Sahel was the main beneficiary of Qaddafi's collapse. AQIM consolidated the efforts of Ansar al Din, MUJAO, and AQIM to overwhelm the semi-secular Tuareg nationalist MNLA and seize control of the Azawad movement. At this point, the moderates ceased to be in control, and the possibility for a negotiated settlement was reduced significantly.[169] There was no evident path to a negotiated settlement with AQIM at the time and the same remains true today. I make two points regarding the irreconcilability of AQIM. First, AQIM is part of a global jihadist movement. AQIM grew out of an Algerian separatist organization known as the GSPC. Al Qaeda engaged in global jihad against the west, primarily focused on the United States after the September 11, 2001 attacks. Bin Laden sought to expand the Al Qaeda franchise and surveyed North Africa for a regional organization that could be internationalized. In 2006, Ayman al Zawahiri announced a formal alliance between the GSPC and Al Qaeda saying, "This blessed union will be a bone in the throat of the American and French crusaders . . . and will bring fear

[169] Djallil Lounnas, "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian Crisis," *Journal of North African Studies* 19, 5 (2014): 822.

to the hearts of the miscreant sons of France."[170] The goals and aspirations of AQIM go far beyond the deserts of North Africa and the organization is not content to settle for political concessions.

AQIM's resources are vulnerable to interdiction for the following reasons. First, AQIM spent a decade establishing training camps in Mali that were destroyed within 4 weeks of French military operations. The French prevented training, destroyed over 2,000 tons of weapons, and targeted key personnel, significantly disrupting their financial operations.[171] Second, the geography of northern Mali is optimal for unmanned drones and attack aviation to interdict movements. The Arab Spring left much of the Sahel ungoverned. In this space, typified by vast desert expanses and semi-arid grasslands, AQIM planned and executed their smuggling and kidnapping operations. The desert offered refuge because AQIM found allies among the local tribes and their training and detention camps were beyond the reach of any government power. This equation fundamentally changed when the French, equipped with Reaper unmanned drones and modern aircraft, identified and destroyed these facilities with minimal collateral damage. [172] They were no longer beyond the reach of any government, and the desert terrain proved to be a suitable backdrop for illuminating the location and disposition of AQIM equipment and personnel. Despite these vulnerabilities, AQIM has proven adept at maintaining revenue streams through kidnap for ransom operations. If European nations pay ransom fees to AQIM, they will maintain a valuable source of revenue, and interdiction of other revenue streams leads to an intensification of kidnapping as a sure way to fill AQIM's coffers.[173]

---

[170] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa,* 21-23.
[171] Ibid, 160.
[172] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa,* 182.
[173] Ibid, 31.

In June 2014, the MNLA, the MIA, and Malian government signed an agreement to allow the Malian army to return to Kidal and hold presidential elections. The Tuareg abandoned their objective of an independent Azawad and renounced extremism. AQIM and MUJAO, still operated in the region, but they wielded significantly less influence among the Tuareg dominated regions. Ansar al-Din, after negotiating with the Algerian government in December of 2012, agreed to renounce extremism and release western hostages. This agreement was later condemned by Iyad Ag Ghali, the Tuareg leader of Ansar al-Din, but the resultant fracturing of the once powerful jihadist organization through an appeal to Tuareg concerns left the organization significantly diminished in capacity. These observations confirm that a viable path to negotiated settlement is normally characterized by political aspirations and a preference for economic and political pragmatism rather than fundamentalism. On the other hand, purely jihadist organizations are irreconcilable but their influence can be minimized through diplomatic cooptation of the portions of the population that are reconcilable. Furthermore, the resources of jihadist organizations are more vulnerable to interdiction. The disposition of AQIM led to a loss of support among the people. AQIM relied on the people to provide active and tacit support, allow storage of weapons and equipment, and to not cooperate with the intervention force or government authorities. Imposition of sharia law and a foreign interpretation of Islam cost AQIM the support of the people and compromised weapons caches, locations of fighters and leadership, and put stress on the support networks that were then identified and disrupted by French aircraft and intelligence collection.

ANALYSIS OF THE INTERVENTION

In the case of Mali, French forces were required to participate directly in ground combat and the neighboring states played a significant role in the containment of the

conflict and the negotiations that occurred before, during, and after. The Malian regime's inability to defend its own borders, and the growing threat of jihadist expansion into north Africa, necessitated an initially robust intervention. The role of French forces in this operation is distinct from the role of US forces in the Philippines, and the contrast provides for useful observations. Mali's neighbors, Algeria in particular, were central to legitimizing the French intervention and marginalizing the influence of the jihadist forces operating in Mali.

Intervention Overview

The French intervened in Mali to secure Bamako, end the jihadist insurgency, and restore the territorial integrity of the Malian state. Within a few months of the decision to intervene, French troops fractured the insurgency and relentlessly pursued AQIM, forcing jihadists to flee into the Adrar des Ifoghas mountains or leave Mali altogether. The capital city of Bamako was more secure than it had been in recent years, and the territorial integrity of Mali was restored under the control of a French and Malian coalition.[174] The French achieved this with a combat force consisting of 4 combined arms groups known as GTIAs 1, 2, 3, and 4 (equivalent of US Army battalions of approximately 800 men each) that were combined from disparate forces stationed in Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, and France at the time. These units were assembled on the road to Bamako on short notice, and their success is a testament to the expeditionary spirit of the French army. Success in Operation Serval came at a cost of 8 French soldiers and 647 million euro.[175] By any reasonable standard, the French overcame significant friction and achieved a resounding success in their war against Islamic extremism in Africa.

---

[174] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa,* 158-9.
[175] Ibid.

Role of French Forces

Operation Serval was conducted in four distinct phases. The first phase consisted of operations to block the insurgency and prevent its spread south of the Niger river. During this phase, GTIA 1 seized a bridge at Markala to enable a future attack on Timbuktu, Malian forces with French advisors seized the city of Konna and another company of GTIA 1 seized the airfield at Sevare.[176] These operations contained the jihadist advance and enforced the Niger river as the temporary border. Simultaneously, French special operations forces carried out attacks on insurgents to prevent an effective insurgent counterattack and disrupt the enemy in depth.[177]

The second phase consisted of the liberation of Gao and Timbuktu. African forces relieved the French from their blocking positions along the Niger river and the French forces attacked north in two columns, one toward Gao and the other towards Timbuktu. At Timbuktu, a French force of 250 paratroopers conduct a night combat jump to seize an airfield and prevent the escape of insurgents. The following day the main force arrived and enemy contact was nil. Likewise, at Gao special operations forces seized the airfield and linked up the following day with the ground force. By the 28th of January both Timbuktu and Gao were under French control. [178] Gao and Timbuktu both became hubs for force projection to pursue the remnants of AQIM in later phases.

The third phase was the pursuit of AQIM into the Adrar des Ifoghas mountains. By January 30th, additional forces had arrived from France and sufficient combat power was assigned to establish security in Gao and Timbuktu. The French continued their pursuit of

---

[176] Olivier Tramond and Philippe Seigneur, "Operation Serval: Another Beau Geste of France in Sub-Saharan Africa?" *Military Review* Dec (2014): 79-81.
[177] Michael Shurkin, "*France's War in Mali: Lessons for an Expeditionary Army*." RAND Corporation, Santa Monica, CA (2014): 16-18.
[178] Olivier Tramond and Philippe Seigneur, "Operation Serval: Another Beau Geste of France in Sub-Saharan Africa?" *Military Review* (2014): 82.

AQIM and this required additional airfields and operational hubs. French special operations forces conducted an airfield seizure at Kidal, in the foothills of the Adrar des Ifoghas mountains where remnants of AQIM sought refuge.[179] The following week on February 8th the process was repeated at Tessalit airfield, providing the French with the necessary tactical infrastructure to support medical evacuation, refuel and re-arm attack helicopters, and provide a secure location for mission preparation and recovery. These bases enabled French forces to operate on foot in the mountains for weeks at a time, clearing valleys of insurgents and weapons caches with continuous close air support. They encountered suicide bombers, crude improvised explosive devices (IEDs), continuous small arms fire, and frequent ambushes.[180] In the Ifoghas, French and Chadian forces combined to kill an estimated 400 jihadists and seize 130 tons of materiel.[181]

Also during the third phase, French forces were engaged in persistent conflict with the MUJAO in Gao. Intelligence suggested approximately 100 fighters in the region. French forces focused on winning the support of the residents and developing intelligence networks. The MUJAO continued to press the French forces, conducting attacks on the 5th, 8th, and 10th of February and a larger attack on the 21st. Patience and intelligence work paid off on the 28th, when French forces conducted an attack on MUJAO forces holed up in a wadi outside of Gao, killing 54 of them. All told, French forces would kill another 200 jihadists and seize another 75 tons of equipment in fighting in and around Gao.[182]

The final phase consisted of the integration of the UN mission with African support and drawdown of French forces to a sustainable long term commitment. By April, there were approximately 5,000 French forces in Mali and the French were eager to avoid an

[179] Ibid, 80-82.
[180] Christopher S. Chiviss, *The French War on Al Qa'ida in Africa,* 128-130.
[181] Ibid, 135.
[182] Ibid, 135-7.

African quagmire. The first troops to enter Mali were rotated back to France and by July, the French had reduced the footprint to 3,200. On April 25, the UN Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali was created with the following mandate:

> The mission would stabilize key population centers, support state-administration countrywide, support security sector reconstruction, develop disarmament programs, support national dialogue efforts, support presidential elections, protect civilians under imminent threat of violence, support humanitarian work, help preserve Mali's national culture, and support national and international justice."[183]

The UN authorized a force of 12,640 security forces to be drawn mostly from Chad with a budget of $800 million per year.[184] The fight is far from over, but Operation Serval delivered a devastating blow to the prospects of AQIM in the region.

The role of French forces in Operation Serval is undeniably beyond the scope of an observer/trainer mission. The French initially acted unilaterally on behalf of a state that lacked both the capacity and legitimacy to conduct a classic counterinsurgency operation. This operation clearly assumed great risk by committing to ground combat with such minimal force, so why did it succeed? My assumption is that when an intervening force acts on behalf of a state that lacks legitimacy and the capacity to provide security for its people, the intervening force will fight an uphill battle to establish itself as legitimate. If the president is viewed as illegitimate, then any power that intervenes on his behalf is at risk of being viewed as illegitimate as well. The intervening force risks being associated with leaders who may commit atrocities or simply lack the capacity to make use of the resources received. This begs the question, was this operation merely a short term tactical success? What potential is there for ensuring long term strategic success? The answer to

[183] Ibid, 140-1.
[184] Ibid.

these questions is best understood through an examination of the French relationship with Mali's neighboring states.

Role of Neighboring States

The French engaged in a broad regional strategy that included the support of Mali's neighbors. French efforts to ensure a coherent regional response, and patience with hesitant allies in the region, paid dividends for their strategy. I argue that Algeria, not France, acted as the regional diplomatic power to provide a framework for the containment of terrorist organizations. The French intervention would carry little regional legitimacy if the Algerians could not be brought on board, but Algiers was determined to negotiate a settlement without French or American intervention.[185] In December of 2012, the Algerian strategy appeared to be working. Ansar al-Din and the MNLA negotiated with Algiers to renounce terrorism and secure the areas of Mali that were currently under their control and release western hostages. The ensuing rejection of the resolution by Iyad ag Ghali, the Tuareg leader of Ansar al-Din, and jihadist attack on the Malian village of Mopti caused a shift in the Algerian attitude toward French intervention, and the Algerians threw their support behind the French calls for action, thus legitimizing the intervention and refuting accusations of French neocolonialism.[186] The French intervention was further legitimized by the encouragement of Mahamadou Issoufou, the president of Niger, and many other African presidents who urged president Hollande to move quickly to destroy the insurgency.[187] The French experienced great difficulty convincing the EU and the US of the threat to regional stability posed by the situation in Mali, but France's African allies were unanimous, after Algeria's change of heart, on the need for intervention.[188]

---

[185] Djallil Lounnas, "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian Crisis," 821.
[186] Ibid, 824.
[187] Roland Marchal, "Military Misadventures in Mali," *African Affairs* 112, (2013): 489.
[188] Ibid, 494.

Algeria not only legitimized the actions of the French, but also provided a framework for a long-term containment strategy for AQIM. Prior to the Arab Spring, Algeria engaged in a delicate balancing act. Regional cooperation with Mali, Mauritania, Morocco, Tunisia, and Libya yielded promising results by containing AQIM. The Algerian Army successfully interdicted AQIM personnel and weapons attempting to enter Algeria from ungoverned spaces in Mali. As I mentioned in the background of this conflict, Algerian forces successfully interdicted 1,200 AQIM jihadists and killed another 250. The Algerian strategy had paid dividends before the events of the Arab Spring. Despite the constitutional limitations of the Algerian government, the commitment to regional collaboration on matters of counterterrorism had a profound effect.[189]

CONCLUSION

French military superiority, Algerian diplomatic engagement and support for the intervention, and the willingness of the other African neighboring states to support the intervention created the conditions under which a military intervention was viewed as legitimate. Among the heads of state, there was a shared sense of urgency and acceptance that France's action was in the best interest of the region. This shared notion of necessity and justice legitimized the intervention and ultimately elicited the cooperation necessary to secure a negotiated settlement with the reconcilable elements of the insurgency.

The Malian regime lacked both capacity and legitimacy. The government was unable to provide basic services due to a lack of resources and institutional capacity. The military was poorly equipped and incapable of providing security for the people. Decades of political exclusion and corruption fueled the separatist ambitions of the Tuareg, who seized an opportunity when large numbers of Tuareg fighters returned to Mali after the

[189] Djallil Lounnas, "Confronting AQIM in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian Crisis," 820.

collapse of the Qaddafi regime. There was strong potential for a meaningful negotiated settlement with the MNLA, due to the political and economic nature of the MNLA's grievances as well as the secular perspective of the organization. AQIM, MUJAO, and the remnants of Ansar al-Din maintain a regional jihadist agenda that precludes negotiated settlement, particularly as these organizations engage in kidnapping for ransom and smuggling activities in the ungoverned regions of North Africa. AQIM has proven vulnerable to resource interdiction. French and Chadian forces seized more than 2,000 tons of weapons and multiple munitions caches. The terrain of northern Mali leaves AQIM vulnerable to the technological advantages of western intelligence collection. The French forces assumed the role of administrator, acting unilaterally to destroy AQIM. African allies were quick to provide troops, but the French forces did not cede any responsibilities for planning or provision of resources, choosing instead to dictate the tempo of the operations until the territorial integrity of Mali was restored. Algiers proved to be an indispensable ally for the French. Despite the colonial history, Algeria consented to French intervention and legitimized the actions. Furthermore, the deft diplomatic acumen of Algiers provides a framework for a regional containment strategy that compensates for Mali's lack of capacity and legitimacy. In the case of Mali, the strength of neighbors and competent coalition building by a key western partner with vastly superior military capabilities created opportunity for success. The future of Operation Serval is in the hands of the Algerians and the French.

Chapter 5: Conclusion

This paper focused on two small footprint operations, the US intervention in the southern Philippines as part of Operation Enduring Freedom and the French intervention in Mali to defeat a collection of Islamist extremists. These two cases provide two starkly different approaches to small footprint operations. Both cases demonstrate the centrality of legitimacy and the potential for third party interveners to legitimate negotiation and connect increased capacity to real gains in perceptions of legitimacy. Recognizing the centrality of legitimacy, the other factors analyzed in this study provide additional information for understanding the context of these interventions and why two distinct models both yielded a positive result. I will articulate a distillation of my findings with regard to each area of analysis.

Institutional capacity is a strong determinant of the counterinsurgency strategy selected by the regime. These two case studies are consistent with Stephen Watts's hypothesis in *Countering Other's Insurgencies*. In each case, the improved capacity of the regime brought about changes in strategy. The GRP adapted its strategy from the brutality of the Marcos era to eventually adopt a classical counterinsurgency model that emphasized development and security over destruction of insurgent forces.[190] In the case of Mali, the lack of institutional capacity led the government to decentralize authority. This decentralization, rather than strengthening the political inclusion of the Tuareg, left Tuareg leaders dependent on patronage and susceptible to corruption and cooptation.[191] In this environment of low capacity, to say nothing of the military's lack of resources, one

[190] Watts et al., *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Interventions in Local Context*, 24.
[191] Jennifer C. Seely, "A Political Analysis of Decentralisation: Coopting the Tuareg Threat in Mali" *Journal of Modern African Studies* 39, 3 (2001): 499-501.

thousand well-armed Tuareg fighters from Libya were able to drastically alter the balance of power and plunge the nation into war.[192] What distinguishes Mali from the Philippines is that in Mali the lack of government capacity was not remedied by improved governance, rather it was rectified directly by a third-party intervention. In the Philippines, the improved governance preceded the intervention. In the case of Mali, the intervention was necessary in an environment of low capacity. This is a valuable distinction that has ramifications for US policy. This shatters the notion that the OEF-Philippines model can be directly applied to future interventions and highlights the significance of context. Understanding the limits of the current regime, and the relationship between capacity and legitimacy, informs the composition and role of the intervention force. This invokes an understanding of the war we're in and not attempting to impose an ill-fitting model of intervention. This leads us to the next factor of governance under consideration, legitimacy.

These two case studies indicate crises of legitimacy. Legitimacy is quantified in this paper through various indicators of political inclusion, trust in institutions, and evaluating evidence of shared notions of justice and consent to authority within the host nation's formal jurisdiction. However, these factors are insufficient to answer the question of how to legitimize a regime. In both cases, the government in question could not generate legitimacy solely through its actions. Intervention brings to light additional questions of legitimacy. Can an illegitimate regime host a legitimate intervention on its behalf? The insight of these case studies is that legitimacy can be established through intervention by outside actors under the right conditions. Both cases demonstrate that the incorporation of regional partners who share ethnic or religious ties with the insurgency, endorse the

[192] Adam Nossiter, "Qaddafi's Weapons, Taken by Old Allies, Reinvigorate an Insurgent Army in Mali'." *New York Times* 5 (2012).

intervention, and possess legitimate and functioning institutions can heavily influence the the possibility of negotiation in favor of peaceful resolution.

Legitimacy in the Philippines was not established directly through actions of the GRP, but through effective mediation and coercion. The GRP appealed to Malaysia to bring the MILF to the table. This alone was not enough. The MILF saw an opportunity with renewed American interest in Southeast Asia, and they appealed directly to president Bush. These two events taken together, the GRP imploring a largely Muslim neighbor to mediate a domestic dispute and the MILF tying American support for the GRP to a contingent expectation of peaceful resolution of the Moro question, effectively bound both parties to the path of peace. In this, the increasingly capable GRP found legitimacy with the Moro people. Both parties came to see the other as legitimate and support for the counterinsurgency strategy enabled the isolation and destruction of more extreme elements. Capacity preceded legitimacy, and legitimacy required outside actors solicited by the belligerents for its establishment.

The Malian government also suffered from a crisis of legitimacy. The interim president, presiding over the government temporarily until democratic elections could be held, did extend an invitation to the French to intervene. The Bamako government was in no position to legitimize the intervention. The unique insight of the French operation is that legitimacy was conferred on the intervention by regional power-brokers and international institutions. This is extraordinarily relevant to US policy, as in the case of both Iraq and Afghanistan, regime changes occurred which precluded the sanction of the host nation at the onset of the intervention. I do not imply a consistent parallel of the US led interventions in those countries with the French led intervention in Mali. I merely imply that legitimizing an intervention is critical to the eventual success of the intervention and should be a consideration at the onset. The French intervention in Mali is instructive as to how

legitimacy can be generated under such conditions, and provides insight as to when it is unreasonable to assume that legitimacy can be established.

The French employed a comprehensive diplomatic and military strategy to legitimize their actions. First, they sought the approval of the UN Security Council and achieved a resolution authorizing force. The UNSCR ensured that the international community viewed intervention as a necessity, given the conditions in Mali. Second, the French secured support from the European Union to support a long-term training program to build the capacity of the Malian army. By doing this, the French ensured that France alone would not bear the costs of training and equipping a Malian force. Third, the French gained the support of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS). This was crucial during the intervention. Nearly 12,000 Chadian troops participated in the operation and they acquitted themselves with valor, particularly in the Adrar des Ifoghas mountains where 26 Chadians were slain in a pitched battle with AQIM.[193] Chadian involvement ensured a regional commitment to stability inside of Mali. In addition to the Chadian contributions, the French were encouraged by Morocco and Mauritania to intervene. This regional buy-in was crucial to legitimizing the intervention. Fourth, the French did not intervene until Algeria approved of the intervention.[194] This is absolutely critical to the legitimacy of the intervention. Algeria occupied a critical position as a regional power-broker. Algeria hosted negotiations between the various separatist groups and the Malian government, and even secured concessions from Ansar al-Din prior to the French intervention. When Ansar al-Din's leadership rejected the agreement and the insurgents attacked south of the Niger River, the Algerians signaled approval for the French

[193] Christopher Chivvis, *The French War on Al Qa'ida inAfrica,* 133.
[194] Djallil Llounnas, "Confronting al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghrib in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian crisis," 824-5.

intervention. Algerian support was the linchpin to establishing French legitimacy. The support from Algiers ensured that accusations of French Neocolonialism would fall on deaf ears, and communicated to the international community that the regional powers trusted French intentions.

In both of these cases, legitimacy was conferred on the interventions through the approval of external actors. This finding is not universal, and cannot be extrapolated to all future interventions. Legitimacy can be derived, it can be conferred, but it cannot be manufactured. Intervening forces can increase the institutional capacity of regimes, and this may, eventually, establish conditions wherein legitimacy can be established, but to do this requires a significant commitment in terms of time and resources. Iraq serves as an example of enhancing capacity without necessarily enhancing legitimacy. The apex of the Iraqi government's legitimacy occurred during the Sunni awakening, when events outside of the government's and the intervening force's control brought people together to address a common problem. But regardless of how much the US increased the capacity of the Iraqi government, the US could not make the government legitimate. Legitimacy is extraordinarily delicate, and these interventions provide insight into the conditions under which intervention can address a crisis of legitimacy.

The path to a negotiated settlement is determined by locating the insurgency's central aim. My research has identified two different categories for identifying this. The first category is political. Political aims consist of rights to ancestral domain, self-determination, economic development, and freedom from persecution. For the Moro people, the GRP historically denied these things. The MILF was formed to advance the cause of Moro independence to achieve these political goals. Likewise, the Tuareg in Mali declared independence for Azawad because of the failure of the Malian regime to represent Tuareg interests. Tuareg aims were rooted in political grievances for greater autonomy and

self-determination. The second category of insurgency is transnational jihadist. In the case of the Philippines, the Abu Sayyaf Group remained a transnational jihadist organization. The ASG sought to transform the Philippines into a Wahabbist state governed by sharia law. This group was funded, trained, and supported by international terrorist organizations. In Mali, AQIM, Ansar al-Din, and MUJAO all represent groups governed by jihadist ideology. There are no concessions that can satisfy these groups, and they must be either eliminated or contained. Groups in this category do not present a path to a negotiated settlement, but these groups are historically more vulnerable to interdiction and destruction.

Stated another way, identifying the insurgency's center of gravity is crucial to determining whether a path to negotiated settlement is viable. If the center of gravity is rooted in concrete realities under the supposed jurisdiction of the government, then there is room to negotiate. The Moro people sought greater political inclusion and regional autonomy. These are concrete concepts that, under the right conditions, will be negotiated for. If the center of gravity is located in a grand ideological vision of world dominance, then the government has no legitimate claim to negotiate with the aspirations of the group. The government cannot submit itself to a vision of world-domination without violating its mandate of political inclusion of other groups. In this case, the center of gravity is beyond the purview of the government and if the insurgency seeks to establish itself inside the physical jurisdiction of the government, the government has no choice but to eradicate the group in question.

VULNERABILITY TO INTERDICTION

There are two primary factors that determine the vulnerability of an insurgency to interdiction. The first factor is disposition: how the insurgency is arrayed and how the insurgency sustains itself. Disposition falls into two broad categories. The first is locally

sustained. The MILF is an example of a locally sustained organization.MILF leadership is well established and military commands are assigned to specific sectors. Because the MILF is an indigenous separatist movement, the insurgency is able to locally resource much of what it needs. The second general category of disposition is a network. AQIM, MUJAO, and ASG are all network based organizations. AQIM relies on ungoverned spaces to establish necessary contacts, plan, and prepare for operations. Resources are frequently transferred from one group to another. Network based organizations are transnational and are not resourced locally. In the case of Mali, AQIM was frequently interdicted moving weapons and supplies to support fighters in Algeria. In the case of AQIM and the ASG, much of their funding is derived through kidnap for ransom operations. These methods of resourcing require much greater risk than national separatist movements that draw their support directly from the people. Additionally, these types of activities draw the attention of powerful western nations who are incentivized to intervene to protect their citizens.

Network organizations attempt to build the relationships to garner local support, but this requires the dispensation of services or other goods, and this consumes resources that locally resourced insurgencies can channel towards weapons and war materiel. Network based groups are at the mercy of their hosts to provide active and tacit support for their operations. Whereas a locally supported disposition allows for greater organization and preservation of resources, assuming the organization does not need to compete for the tacit support of the population. This distinction is significant, as it often exists within the confines of various nations. Both types of organizations operate in Afghanistan and Iraq, and distinguishing between the two general categories enables the host nation and the intervening force to determine who is reconcilable and who must be destroyed.

The second factor that determines vulnerability to interdiction is the terrain. The southern Philippines is severely restricted terrain. Much of Mindanao is outside of the

effective jurisdiction of the GRP, and dense tree cover obscures intelligence collection and facilitates a prolonged guerrilla campaign. This has strengthened the position of the MILF, and may be what encouraged the GRP to pursue reconciliation rather than annihilation in the first place. Successful interdiction of resources in this type of environment requires significant military capacity, and it is simply beyond the reach of most governments managing these crises. Intervening forces can, however, provide the needed additional capabilities that can reduce the effectiveness of restrictive terrain. Examples of this include the US intervention in Afghanistan where American troops established combat outposts along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border to deny the use of restrictive terrain for trafficking of illicit materiel as well as Taliban fighters. The Afghan government lacked the capacity to interdict these resources, but strategically placed troops and sustained surveillance can deny the advantage of restrictive terrain to insurgencies.

ROLE OF INTERVENING STATE AND NEIGHBORS

Small footprint operations can implement the observer, trainer, or administrator roles. The US operation in the Philippines provides a textbook small footprint operation. All operations were conducted by, with, and through the GRP to enable the host nation to become more capable and legitimate. This didn't occur simply because of American adherence to principle. What guaranteed the relegation of US troops to an observer/trainer role was the insistence of the GRP. The GRP could insist on a non-combat role because, comparatively speaking, the GRP was a highly capable government. This is an anomaly of intervention, not the norm, and should be understood as an ideal that is rarely attained. In contrast, the French intervention in Mali entailed participation in direct combat. This clearly violates the assumption that small footprint operations require an abstinence from direct action. However, in defense of the French strategy, the intervention in Mali

employed a model of aggressive ground combat to decisively and rapidly defeat an insurgent force, followed by a regionally sourced peacekeeping force to build capacity and secure the major population centers. French audacity put the enemy to flight and created the breathing room necessary for the Malian government to reorganize and rebuild. This was done with a commitment to a long term regional peace strategy that included development projects through the World Bank and an EU commitment to provide training and resources for the Malian defense forces. Commitment to a less invasive model would have cost the French and the Malians dearly, in terms of lives, time, and treasure. What enabled the French to cross this boundary of direct action? I argue that it was the legitimacy conferred on France through the role of Mali's neighboring states who understood the nature of the threat. These two interventions provide dramatically different approaches in this regard, and both approaches, given the underlying conditions, were both small footprint and successful in achieving their intention.

In sum, small footprint strategies are highly contingent on a variety of factors for their success. The small footprint models detailed in this paper are not broadly applicable, yet they do inform strategies for dealing with low-intensity conflict. Nothing in this research obviates the need for a strong and capable military. There is no substitute for strength. However, when the conditions permit the advancement of US foreign policy goals through small footprint intervention, policymakers would be wise to recognize the contextual limitations of such strategies outlined in this paper and the inherent challenges to legitimizing both the intervention and the host nation.

Bibliography

Banlaoi, Rommel C. "The Abu Sayyaf Group: From mere banditry to genuine terrorism." *Southeast Asian Affairs* (2006): 247-262.

Baviera, Aileen SP. "Aquino: Pushing the envelope, single-mindedly." *Southeast Asian Affairs* 2012, no. 1 (2012): 241-256.

Berdal, Mats. *Building Peace After War*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

Bertrand, Jacques. "Peace and conflict in the southern Philippines: Why the 1996 peace agreement is fragile." *Pacific Affairs* (2000): 37-54.

Bøås, Morten, and Liv E. Torheim. "The international intervention in Mali:“Desert blues” or a new beginning?." *International Journal: Canada's Journal of Global Policy Analysis* (2013).

Boutellis, Arthur. "Can the UN Stabilize Mali? Towards a UN Stabilization Doctrine?." *Stability: International Journal of Security and Development* 4, no. 1 (2015).

Buendia, Rizal. “The GRP-MILF Peace Talks: Quo Vadis?” *Southeast Asian Affairs* (2004): 205-221.

Chafer, Tony. "France in Mali: Towards a new Africa strategy?." *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 19, no. 2 (2016): 119-141.

Chalk, Peter, Angel Rabasa, William Rosenau, and Leanne Piggott. *The Evolving Terrorist Threat in Southeast Asia: A Net Assessment.* Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2009.

Chivvis, Christopher S. *The French War on Al Qa’ida inAfrica*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2016.

Clausewitz, Carl von. *On War*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1976.

Ebrahim, Murad, Teresita Quintos Deles, and Abdul Ghafar bin Mohamed. "Peace at Last in Southern Philippines? The Framework Agreement on the Bangsamoro." *Asian Politics & Policy* 5, no. 4 (2013): 627-653.

Egnell, Robert. "Winning ‘hearts and minds’? A critical analysis of counter-insurgency operations in Afghanistan." *Civil Wars* 12, no. 3 (2010): 282-303.

Ellis, Stephen. "Briefing: the pan-Sahel initiative." *African Affairs* 103, no. 412 (2004): 459-464.

Emmers, Ralf. "Comprehensive security and resilience in Southeast Asia: ASEAN's approach to terrorism 1." *The Pacific Review* 22, no. 2 (2009): 159-177.

Fabe Amparo, Pamela. "The Cost of Terrorism: Bombings by the Abu Sayyaf Group in the Philippines." *Philippine Sociological Review* (2013): 229-250.

Fearon, James and David Laitin. “Ethnicity, Insurgency, and Civil War.” *American Political Science Review* 97 (2003): 75-90.

Filiu, Jean-Pierre. "Al-Qaida in the Islamic Maghrib: Algerian Challenge or Global Threat?." (2009).

Francis, David J. "The regional impact of the armed conflict and French intervention in Mali." *Oslo: Norwegian Peacebuilding Resource Centre*, April 9 (2013).

Frynas, Jedrzej George, and Manuel Paulo. "A new scramble for African oil? Historical, political, and business perspectives." *African Affairs* 106, no. 423 (2007): 229-251.

Gerdes, Luke M., Kristine Ringler, and Barbara Autin. "Assessing the Abu Sayyaf Group's Strategic and Learning Capacities." *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 37, no. 3 (2014): 267-293.

Gladstone, Rick. “U.N. Council Votes to Help Mali’s Army Oust Islamists.” *The New York Times*, December 20 (2012).

Hicks, Celeste. "How the French Operation Serval was viewed on the ground: A journalistic perspective." *International Journal of Francophone Studies* 19, no. 2 (2016): 193-207.

Keita, Kalifa. "Conflict and conflict resolution in the Sahel: The Tuareg insurgency in Mali." *Small Wars & Insurgencies* 9, no. 3 (1998): 102-128.

Lecocq, Baz, and Georg Klute. "Tuareg separatism in Mali 1." *International Journal* 68, no. 3 (2013): 424-434.

Lecocq, Baz, and Paul Schrijver. "The war on terror in a haze of dust: Potholes and pitfalls on the Saharan front." *Journal of Contemporary African Studies* 25, no. 1 (2007): 141-166.

Lounnas, Djallil. "Confronting al-Qa'ida in the Islamic Maghrib in the Sahel: Algeria and the Malian crisis." *The Journal of North African Studies* 19, no. 5 (2014): 810-827.

Manual, Field. "Manual 3-24." Counterinsurgency, Washington, DC: Headquarters, Department of the Army 15 (2006).

Marchal, Roland. “Military Misadventures in Mali.” *African Affairs* 112 (2013): 489-507.

Maxwell, David S. "Operation Enduring Freedom-Philippines: What Would Sun Tzu Say?." *Military Review* 84, no. 3 (2004): 20.

McIndoe, Alastair. "Letter From Manila: Ending A Long Insurgency in the Philippines." *Foreign Affairs* (2010).

McMaster, H.R. “On War: Lessons to be Learned.” *Survival* 50 (2008): 19-30.

Miller, Paul D. *Armed State Building: Confronting State Failure, 1898-2012*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2013.

Neumann, Hannah. "Identity-building and democracy in the Philippines: national failure and local responses in Mindanao." *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 29, no. 3 (2010): 61-90.

Nossiter, Adam. "Qaddafi's Weapons, Taken by Old Allies, Reinvigorate an Insurgent Army in Mali'." *New York Times* 5 (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "Soldiers overthrow Mali government in setback for democracy in Africa." *New York Times* 22 (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "In Timbuktu, harsh change under islamists." *The New York Times* (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "Jihadists' Fierce Justice Drives Thousands to Flee Mali." *New York Times* 17 (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "Saying Mali is 'Our Country', Militias Train to Oust Islamists." *New York Times*, Aug 5 (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "The Whiff of Conflict Grows in Mali." *New York Times*, Oct 23 (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "Millions in ransoms fuel militants clout in West Africa." *New York Times* (2012).

Nossiter, Adam. "Mali Government Is Left Reeling After Islamists Take Village Long Held by Army." *The New York Times*, Jan 10 (2013).

Nossiter, N., and Eric Schmitt. "France Battling Islamists in Mali." *New York Times* (2013).

Pezard, Stephanie, and Michael Shurkin. *Achieving Peace in Northern Mali: Past Agreements, Local Conflicts, and the Prospects for a Durable Settlement*. Rand Corporation, 2015.

Paris, Roland. *At War's End: Building Peace After Civil Conflict*. New York: Cambridge, 2004.

Petit, Brian. "OEF-Philippines: Thinking COIN, Practicing FID." *Special Warfare* 23, no. 1 (2010): 10-15.

Ping, Jean. "The Crisis in Mali: Outline the Course to Peace and Stability." *Harvard International Review* 35, no. 3 (2014): 22.

Polgreen, Lydia, and Alan Cowell. "Mali Rebels Proclaim Independent State in North." *The New York Times* (2012).

Porter, Gareth. "Counterinsurgency in the Philippines: Aquino was Right." *SAIS Review* 7 (1987): 93-108.

Quimpo, Nathan Gilbert. "Options in the pursuit of a just, comprehensive, and stable peace in the Southern Philippines." *Asian Survey* 41, no. 2 (2001): 271-289.

Robinson, Linda. "The SOF Experience in the Philippines and the Implications for Future Defense Strategy." *Prism: a Journal of the Center for Complex Operations* 6, no. 3 (2016): 150.

Rogers, Steven. "Beyond the Abu Sayyaf-The Lessons of Failure in the Philippines." *Foreign Affairs* 83 (2004): 15.

Saraceno, Francesco. "Reflections on Azawad Crisis and Malian Democracy: The Statehood, its Deficiencies and Inclusion Failure." *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 50, no. 3 (2015): 343-358.

Seely, Jennifer C. "A political analysis of decentralisation: coopting the Tuareg threat in Mali." *The Journal of Modern African Studies* 39, no. 03 (2001): 499-524.

Shurkin, Michael. *France's war in Mali: Lessons for an expeditionary army*. RAND ARROYO CENTER SANTA MONICA CA, 2014.

Solomon, Hussein. "The African state and the failure of US counter-terrorism initiatives in Africa: The cases of Nigeria and Mali." *South African Journal of International Affairs* 20, no. 3 (2013): 427-445.

Tramond, Olivier, and Philippe Seigneur. "Operation Serval: Another Beau Geste of France in Sub-Saharan Africa?." *Military Review* 94, no. 6 (2014): 76.

Van Engeland, Anisseh, and Rachael M. Rudolph. *From terrorism to politics*. Routledge, 2016.

Watts, Stephen, Caroline Baxter, Molly Dunigan, and Christopher Rizzi. *The Uses and Limits of Small-Scale Military Intervention*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2012.

Watts, Stephen, Jason Campbell, Patrick Johnson, Sameer Lalwani, and Sarah Bana. *Countering Others' Insurgencies: Understanding US Small-Footprint Operations in Local Context*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2014.

Wilson, Gregory. "Anatomy of a Successful COIN Operation: OEF Philippines and the Indirect Approach." *Military Review* 86 (2006): 2-12.

Wing, Susanna D. "Mali: Politics of a crisis." *African Affairs* 112, no. 448 (2013): 476-485.